

FEEDING THE HOMELESS: DOES THE
PREPARED MEALS PROVISION HELP?

REPORT TO CONGRESS ON THE
PREPARED MEAL PROVISION

VOLUME II: SUPPORTING TABLES
AND DOCUMENTATION

Prepared by:

The Urban Institute
Martha R. Burt
Barbara E. Cohen

With Contributions on Nutritional Analysis from
Nancy Chapman, Chapman Associates

Prepared for:

Food and Nutrition Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture

Submitted to:

Committee on Agriculture,
Nutrition and Forestry
U.S. Senate

Committee on Agriculture
U.S. House of Representatives

October 31, 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 1: SUPPORTING TABLES

TABLES DOCUMENTING CHARACTERISTICS OF MEAL AND SHELTER PROVIDERS.....1

Table

1. Years in Services, by Type of Provider.....	2
2. Distribution of Providers, By Type and Size of Provider.....	3
3. Size of Provider by Type of Meal Served.....	4
4. Number of Days Per Week Meals Are Served, and Number of Meals Served Per Day, by Provider Type.....	5
5. Estimated Number of Meals Available to the Homeless Per Day in Cities of 100,000 or More, by Provider Type.....	6
6. Estimated Number of Beds Available at Shelter Providers Per Night in Cities of 100,000 or More, by Provider Type.....	7
7. Services Other than Food and Shelter Offered by Providers, by Type of Provider.....	8
8. Number of Services Offered by Providers of Different Types.....	9
9. Total Meal Service Budget and Food Expenses During Provider's Last Fiscal Year by Provider Type, for All Providers Supplying Expense Data.....	10
10. Total Meal Service Budget and Food Expenses During Provider's Last Fiscal year by Number of Meals Served, for All Providers Supplying Expense Data.....	11
11. Proportion of Meal Providers Using Given Levels of Paid and Volunteer Labor Hours Per Week for Meal Services.....	12
12. Food Service Experience or Training Among Staff of Meal Service Providers.....	13
13. Number of Different Food Groups Served, by Type of Meal.....	14
14. Mean Number of Servings from Each of 10 Food Groups Observed in Meals Offered by Soup Kitchens and Shelters, by Type of Meal.....	15
15. Association between Size of Provider and Estimated Average Number of Calories Per Meal.....	16

TABLES DOCUMENTING THE CHARACTERISTICS AND OTHER INTERVIEW RESPONSES OF HOMELESS PERSONS.....17

Table

1. Comparisons of Descriptive Data from Other Studies.....	19
2. Single-day and 7-day Estimates of Service-using Homeless Individuals and of the Children Homeless with Them, for March 1987, in cities of 100,000 or more.....	21
3. Sex, Race and Age of Homeless Service Users.....	22
4. Comparison of Selected Characteristics of the Service-using Homeless to the U.S. Population Residing in MSAs.....	23
5. Service Use Patterns of Homeless Adults and Children.....	24

6. Household Composition, Marital Status and Education of the Service-using Homeless, by their Pattern of Service Use.....	25
7. Current Sources of Income Among the Service-using Homeless, by Selected Characteristics.....	26
8. History of Homelessness and Work Among the Service-using Homeless, by Pattern of Service Use.....	27
9. Respondent Perceptions of Health Status.....	28
10. Perceptions of Health and Reported Health Problems.....	29
11. Sleep/rest Locations Used by Service-using Homeless Persons During the 7 Nights Preceding the Interview.....	30
12. Reported Frequency of Eating among Homeless Service Users, by Pattern of Service Use.....	31
13. Percent of Service-using Homeless Individuals Reporting Absence of Specific Food Groups from their Diet, by Pattern of Service Use.....	32
14. Perceived Healthfulness of Diet among Service-using Homeless Persons.....	33
15. Service-using Homeless Persons' Perceptions of Food Sufficiency.....	34
16. Total Number of Servings of All Foods Eaten on the Day Before the Interview, as Reported by Service-using Homeless Respondents, by Pattern of Service Use.....	35
17. Percent of Service-using Homeless Respondents Who Report Eating Foods from Different Food Groups, by Pattern of Service Use.....	36
18. Average Number of Servings Per Food Group in One-day Food Lists Reported by Service-using Homeless Persons.....	37
19. Average Percentage of Homeless Individuals' Daily Intake from Grains, Meats, Vegetables and fruits, Milk, and Miscellaneous Food.....	38
20. Percentage of Homeless Respondents Using 9 Food Sources During 7 Days Preceding the Interview, by Number of Days the Source Was Used.....	39
21. Demographic Characteristics of Homeless Adult Members of Families, Compared to Homeless Single Adults.....	40
22. Resources of Homeless Adult Members of Families, Compared to Homeless Single Adults.....	41
23. Perceptions of Diet among Homeless Adult Members of Families, Compared to Homeless Single Adults.....	42
24. Reported Frequency of Eating among Homeless Adult Members of Families, Compared to Homeless Single Adults.....	43
25. Problems Experienced by Homeless Adult Members of Families, Compared to Homeless Single Adults.....	44
26. Factors Associated with Frequency of Eating Reported by Service-using Homeless Individuals.....	45
27. Factors Associated with Dietary Intake Reported by Service-using Homeless Individuals.....	46
28. Comparison of Demographic and Other Characteristics: Non-user Homeless and Service-using Homeless.....	47
29. Comparison of Health, Mental Health and Institutionalizations: Non-user Homeless and Service-using Homeless.....	48
30. Comparison of Food and Nutrition Data: Non-user Homeless and Service-using Homeless.....	49
31. Comparing New York to Non-New York Respondents, All Respondents Combined.....	50

32. Comparing New York to Non-New York Respondents, Respondents With Children Only.....	51
33. Comparing New York to Non-New York Respondents, Respondents Without Children Only.....	52

TABLES DOCUMENTING PATTERNS OF RECEIPT AND USE OF FOOD STAMPS BY HOMELESS PERSONS.....	53
---	-----------

Table

1. Individual Characteristics Associated with Current Receipt of Food Stamps: Binomial Logistical Regression Results.....	54
2. Food Stamp Use among the Homeless.....	55
3. Homeless Households Reporting a Mailing Address, by FSP Program Status, Presence of a Child, and Type of Service They Use.....	56
4. Homeless Households Reporting a Place to Cook Food, by FSP Program Status, Presence of a Child, and Type of Service They Use.....	57

PART 2: SUPPLEMENTARY STATISTICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL DOCUMENTATION

**SECTION A: HOMELESS ELIGIBILITY CLARIFICATION ACT OF 1986
FINAL REGULATIONS GOVERNING PURCHASE OF PREPARED MEALS**

SECTION B: SAMPLING AND WEIGHTING METHODS

SECTION C: STUDY INSTRUMENTS

**SECTION D: LIST OF PROVIDERS AUTHORIZED TO ACCEPT FOOD STAMPS UNDER
THE PREPARED MEALS PROVISION, AS OF MARCH 31, 1988**

**SECTION E: METHOD FOR COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS OF FOOD GROUP AND
NUTRIENT DATA**

PART 1
SUPPORTING TABLES

TABLES DOCUMENTING CHARACTERISTICS OF MEAL AND SHELTER PROVIDERS.....	1
TABLES DOCUMENTING THE CHARACTERISTICS AND OTHER INTERVIEW RESPONSES OF HOMELESS PERSONS.....	17
TABLES DOCUMENTING PATTERNS OF RECEIPT AND USE OF FOOD STAMPS BY HOMELESS PERSONS.....	53

SUPPORTING TABLES DOCUMENTING SELECTED
CHARACTERISTICS OF MEAL AND SHELTER PROVIDERS

The tables provided here give supporting information obtained from interviews with 381 providers of food and shelter for the homeless in the 20 sampled cities representative of U.S. cities of 100,000 or more. The first two tables show the number of years different types of providers have been in service and the size of different types of providers. The next three tables (3-5) give information about which providers serve different meals, and how many meals are available. Tables 6 through 8 show services other than meals, such as shelter beds, health care and clothing, that are available from providers. Tables 9 and 10 give budget information by type and size of provider, and also indicate the average cost of a single meal from these providers. The next two tables indicate the paid and volunteer labor available to soup kitchens and shelters serving meals, and the types of food service experience and training that staff or volunteers bring to the preparation of meals for the homeless. The last three tables display information about the contents of the meals available from providers, including calories, and the numbers and types of food groups present in the meals.

SUPPORTING TABLE 1, DATA FROM MEAL AND SHELTER PROVIDERS

YEARS IN SERVICE, BY TYPE OF PROVIDER
(weighted percentages)

	<u>Soup Kitchens</u>	<u>Shelters Without Meals</u>	<u>Shelters With Meals</u>	<u>Totals</u>
	(N = 151)	(N = 46)	(N = 184)	(N = 381)
<u>Years in Service</u>				
< 2 years	26	11	19	21
2-4 years	12	21	22	18
5-8 years	26	45	18	24
9-20 years	23	16	23	22
21+ years	14	7	18	15
Totals	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Mean	13	10	16	18
Median	6	5	6	6
Range	0 - 114	0 - 87	0 - 114	0 - 114

"N" refers to unweighted N's. All percentages are based on weighted data.

SUPPORTING TABLE 2, DATA FROM MEAL AND SHELTER PROVIDERS

DISTRIBUTION OF PROVIDERS, BY TYPE AND SIZE OF PROVIDER
(weighted percentages)

<u>Soup Kitchens</u>	<u>Shelters Without Meals</u>	<u>Shelters With Meals</u>	<u>Totals</u>
(N = 151)	(N = 46)	(N = 184)	(N = 381)

Providers:

Serving 10-25	28	36	25	27
Serving 26-50	17	15	30	23
Serving 51-99	21	31	30	27
Serving 100+	34	17	15	23
	<u>100</u>	<u>99</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

"N" refers to unweighted N's. All percentages are based on weighted data. Percents may not sum to 100% due to rounding errors.

SUPPORTING TABLE 3, DATA FROM MEAL AND SHELTER PROVIDERS

SIZE OF PROVIDER BY TYPE OF MEAL SERVED
(weighted data)

<u>Size of Provider</u>	<u>Breakfast</u> (N = 205)	<u>Midday</u> <u>Meal</u> (N = 228)	<u>Evening</u> <u>Meal</u> (N = 234)
Serving 1-25	26	30	25
Serving 26-50	28	20	27
Serving 51-99	31	21	30
Serving 100+	15	30	18
Total	100	101	100
Mean	73	101	87
Median	48	74	50
Range	6-700	3-850	3-861

*N" refers to unweighted N's. All figures are based on weighted data.
Percents may not sum to 100% due to rounding errors.

SUPPORTING TABLE 4, DATA FROM MEAL AND SHELTER PROVIDERS

NUMBER OF DAYS PER WEEK MEALS ARE SERVED
AND NUMBER OF MEALS SERVED PER DAY,
BY PROVIDER TYPE
(weighted percentages)

	<u>Soup Kitchens</u> (N = 151)	<u>Shelters With Meals</u> (N = 184)	<u>Totals</u> (N = 335)
<u>Number of Days Per Week that Provider Serves Meals</u>			
1	15	0	7
2	7	0	3
3	7	2	4
4	5	1	3
5	19	2	9
6	14	3	8
7	32	92	65
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Number of Meals Per Day that Provider Serves</u>			
1	72	11	38
2	25	35	30
3	3	54	31
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

"N" refers to unweighted N's of providers in the sample. All percentages are based on weighted data.

SUPPORTING TABLE 5, DATA FROM MEAL AND SHELTER PROVIDERS

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF MEALS AVAILABLE TO THE HOMELESS PER DAY
IN CITIES OF 100,000 OR MORE, BY PROVIDER TYPE
(weighted data)

	<u>Soup Kitchens</u> (N = 151)	<u>Shelters With Meals</u> (N = 184)	<u>Totals</u> (N = 335)
<u>Total Number of Meals Served</u>			
Number	97,112	224,039	321,152
Percent	30	70	100
95% Confidence Interval	± 5,904	± 13,850	± 15,561
Range			
Low	103,016	237,889	336,713
High	91,208	210,189	305,591

"N" refers to unweighted N's. All figures are based on weighted data. The estimate of soup kitchen meals given in this table is 57 percent of all meals served at soup kitchens, to adjust for the fact that in our data collection with homeless individuals, only 57 percent of those contacted at soup kitchens were homeless. Estimates for both soup kitchens and shelters have been adjusted to account for providers who operate fewer than 7 days a week.

SUPPORTING TABLE 6, DATA FROM MEAL AND SHELTER PROVIDERS

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF BEDS AVAILABLE AT SHELTER PROVIDERS PER NIGHT
IN CITIES OF 100,000 OR MORE, BY PROVIDER TYPE
(weighted data)

	<u>Shelters Without Meals (N = 46)</u>	<u>Shelters With Meals (N = 184)</u>	<u>Totals (N = 230)</u>
<u>Total Number of Beds Provided</u>			
Number	35,610	84,026	119,637
Percent	30	70	100
95% Confidence Interval	± 5431	± 5858	$\pm 8,062$
Range			
Low	30,179	78,168	111,575
High	41,041	89,884	127,699

"N" refers to unweighted N's. All figures are based on weighted data.

SUPPORTING TABLE 7, DATA FROM MEAL AND SHELTER PROVIDERS

SERVICES OTHER THAN FOOD AND SHELTER
OFFERED BY PROVIDERS
BY TYPE OF PROVIDER
(weighted percentages)

<u>Type of Service</u>	<u>Soup Kitchens</u>	<u>Shelters Without Meals</u>	<u>Shelters With Meals</u>	<u>Totals</u>
	(N=151)	(N= 46)	(N=184)	(N = 381)
Clothing	56	54	93	73
Health Care:				
Referrals	45	88	91	72
Shower/Bath/Shave	19	83	93	62
Mail Receiving	24	84	90	62
Social Work				
Counseling	30	85	80	60
Carfare/				
Transportation	29	80	69	54
Legal Services	21	52	71	48
Job Training				
Placement	26	51	63	47
Personal Storage	9	61	71	45
Religious Services	45	2	56	45
Laundry	14	48	68	44
Recreation	16	50	63	42
Job Placement	19	39	48	35
Health Care:				
On-Site	17	44	28	25
Child Care/				
Community Outreach	14	19	28	21
Education/GED/				
Workshops	5	8	21	13
Housing Referrals	6	24	15	12
Access to				
Free Telephone	8	10	10	9
Financial				
Assistance	3	12	10	7

"N" refers to unweighted N's. All percentages are based on weighted data.

SUPPORTING TABLE 9, DATA FROM MEAL AND SHELTER PROVIDERS

TOTAL MEAL SERVICE BUDGET AND FOOD EXPENSES
DURING PROVIDER'S LAST FISCAL YEAR BY PROVIDER TYPE,
FOR ALL PROVIDERS SUPPLYING EXPENSE DATA
(weighted percentages)

	Provider Type		
	Soup Kitchens (N = 120)	Shelters with Meals (N = 156)	All Meal Providers (N = 276)
Total Meal Service Budget, Provider's Last Fiscal Year			
\$0-999	11	5	8
\$1,000-4,999	9	7	8
\$5,000-9,999	18	8	13
\$10,000-24,999	20	22	21
\$25,000-49,999	21	21	21
\$50,000-74,999	15	10	12
\$75,000 and up	6	27	17
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Outlays for Food, Provider's Last Fiscal Year			
\$0	3	7	5
\$1-500	8	3	5
\$501-2,000	14	8	11
\$2,001-5,000	17	11	14
\$5,001-10,000	29	18	23
\$10,001-20,000	13	20	17
\$20,001-40,000	9	16	13
\$40,001 and up	6	18	12
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Average Food Cost Per Meal	\$0.39	\$0.56	\$0.48

"N" refers to weighted N's. All percentages are based on weighted N's. In this table the N's are smaller than the provider universe due to non-response; 21 percent of soup kitchens and 15 percent of shelters with meals could not give budget figures for meal services.

SUPPORTING TABLE 10, DATA FROM MEAL AND SHELTER PROVIDERS

TOTAL MEAL SERVICE BUDGET AND FOOD EXPENSES
DURING PROVIDER'S LAST FISCAL YEAR BY NUMBER OF MEALS SERVED,
FOR ALL PROVIDERS SUPPLYING EXPENSE DATA
(weighted percentages)

	Number of Meals Providers Served			
	Serving 1-100 (N = 101)	Serving 101-200 (N = 73)	Serving 201-300 (N = 37)	Serving 300+ (N = 55)
<u>Total Meal Service Budget, Provider's Last Fiscal Year</u>				
\$0-999	13	7	1	1
\$1,000-4,999	11	11	6	0
\$5,000-9,999	13	21	4	1
\$10,000-24,999	30	27	11	0
\$25,000-49,999	20	5	28	43
\$50,000-74,999	4	10	25	26
\$75,000 and up	9	19	25	29
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Outlays for Food, Provider's Last Fiscal Year</u>				
\$0	6	8	0	0
\$1-499	8	7	0	1
\$500-1,999	18	8	9	0
\$2,000-4,999	16	21	6	4
\$5,000-9,999	17	17	2	53
\$10,000-19,999	22	15	24	7
\$20,000-39,999	6	20	28	9
\$40,000 and up	7	4	32	26
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Average Food Cost Per Meal</u>	\$0.53	\$0.58	\$0.45	\$0.36

"N" refers to unweighted N's. All percentages are based on weighted N's. In this table the N's are smaller than the provider universe due to non-response.

SUPPORTING TABLE 11, DATA FROM MEAL AND SHELTER PROVIDERS

PROPORTION OF MEAL PROVIDERS USING GIVEN LEVELS
OF PAID AND VOLUNTEER LABOR HOURS PER WEEK FOR MEAL SERVICES
(weighted percentages)
(N = 335)

<u>Hours/Week</u>	<u>Paid Staff</u>	<u>Volunteers</u>
0	35	16
1-20	18	23
21-40	14	18
41-80	16	10
81-200	18	19
201 or more	0	14
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

"N" refers to unweighted N's. All percentages are based on weighted data.

SUPPORTING TABLE 12, DATA FROM MEAL AND SHELTER PROVIDERS

FOOD SERVICE EXPERIENCE OR TRAINING
AMONG STAFF OF MEAL SERVICE PROVIDERS
(weighted percentages)

<u>Type of Experience</u>	<u>Providers Indicating Staff with Food Service Experience</u>	<u>All Meal Providers</u>
	(N = 221)	(N = 335)
Cook or restaurant owner	91	63
Home economics degree	2	1
Nutritionist/dietician	25	17
Food preparation certificate	9	6
No experience or training	0	27

"N" refers to unweighted N's. All percentages are based on weighted data. Percents do not sum to 100% due to multiple responses.

SUPPORTING TABLE 13, DATA FROM MEAL AND SHELTER PROVIDERS

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT FOOD GROUPS SERVED,
BY TYPE OF MEAL
(weighted percentages)

	Type of Meal		
	Breakfast (N = 45)	Lunch (N = 135)	Dinner (N = 128)
<u>Number of Food Groups Observed in Provider Meals from:</u>			
<u>5 Core Groups^a</u>			
No groups	0	0	0
1 group	10	0	0
2 groups	29	7	6
3 groups	33	38	43
4 groups	18	46	36
All 5 groups	10	9	15
	100	100	100
Mean	2.9	3.6	3.6
Median	3	4	3
<u>Additional 5 Groups^b</u>			
No groups	9	18	21
1 group	56	42	36
2 groups	28	32	29
3 groups	7	4	11
4 groups	0	4	3
All 5 groups	0	0	0
	100	100	100
Mean	1.3	1.3	1.4
Median	1	1	1

"N" refers to unweighted N's of meals observed. All percentages are based on weighted data.

^a milk and milk products, grain products, fruits and fruit juices, vegetables, and meats and meat alternates.

^b fats and oils, baked goods, sweets, sweetened beverages and salty snacks.

SUPPORTING TABLE 14, DATA FROM MEAL AND SHELTER PROVIDERS

MEAN NUMBER OF SERVINGS FROM EACH OF 10 FOOD GROUPS
OBSERVED IN MEALS OFFERED BY SOUP KITCHENS AND SHELTERS,
BY TYPE OF MEAL

<u>Food Group</u>	<u>Type of Meal</u>		
	<u>Breakfast</u> (N = 45)	<u>Lunch</u> (N = 135)	<u>Dinner</u> (N = 128)
Milk and Milk Products	.7	.6	.8
Grains and Grain Products	2.0	1.7	2.0
Fruits and Fruit Juices	.5	.3	.4
Vegetables	.3	1.0	1.5
Meat and Meat Alternates	1.0	1.0	1.3
Fats and Oils	1.0	.6	.6
Baked Goods	.4	.6	.5
Sweets	.3	.2	.1
Sweetened Beverages	.1	.2	.3
Salty Snacks	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mean Number of Servings, all Food Groups Combined	6.3	6.2	7.4

"N" refers to unweighted N's of meals observed. All figures are based on weighted data.

SUPPORTING TABLE 15, DATA FROM MEAL AND SHELTER PROVIDERS

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN SIZE OF PROVIDER
AND ESTIMATED AVERAGE NUMBER OF CALORIES PER MEAL
(weighted percentages)

	Provider Size				All Meal Providers
	Serving 10-25	Serving 26-50	Serving 51-99	Serving 100+	
	(N = 65)	(N = 67)	(N = 68)	(N = 108)	(N=308)
<u>Estimated Average Number of Calories Per Meal</u>					
Less than 500	10	14	6	23	13
500-775	18	14	21	21	21
776-1078	26	24	22	27	25
1079-1525	16	25	47	25	28
More than 1525	30	13	4	4	13
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

"N" refers to unweighted N's for meals observed. All percentages are based on weighted data.

DOCUMENTING THE CHARACTERISTICS AND OTHER
INTERVIEW RESPONSES OF HOMELESS PERSONS

Data about the characteristics of homeless individuals were obtained through in-person interviews with 1704 users of meal and shelter services in 20 U.S. cities representative of all cities of 100,000 or more, and from 142 non-service users found in parks, bus stations and other congregating sites in those same cities. This study is the first to obtain national data from homeless persons. The first table in this section compares the findings in this study on selected variables to local and state surveys of homeless persons. The next table presents the estimates of population size for the service-using homeless. Tables 3 through 11 show the findings for many characteristics of the homeless, including demographic characteristics, service use patterns, household composition, education, income and income sources, length of homelessness and joblessness, health status, and sleeping patterns.

Tables 12 through 20 present detailed information about the eating patterns, dietary intake during the day preceding the interview, and food sources reported by homeless persons, comparing them to USDA recommendations for dietary intake where these are available.

Tables 21 through 25 show the differences on key variables between single homeless persons and homeless persons in families (i.e., with at least one child present).

Tables 26 and 27 show the factors that influence eating patterns and dietary intake on the day before the interview, using regression analysis. Eighteen factors are included, ranging from cash and in-kind resources including food stamps, through demographic characteristics to patterns of service use and prior institutionalizations.

Tables 28 through 30 give the comparisons between homeless individuals who do use the services of soup kitchens and shelters, and those who do not use these services.

Tables 31 through 33 show the differences between respondents interviewed in New York City and those interviewed elsewhere, for all respondents and then separately for homeless households with children and homeless households (usually a single person) without children.

SUPPORTING TABLE 1, DATA FROM HOMELESS
INDIVIDUALS

COMPARISONS OF DESCRIPTIVE DATA FROM OTHER STUDIES

Study and Year Data Collected	Urban Institute (1987)	Chicago (1985-86)	Minne- apolis (1985-86)	L.A. DHI (1984-85)	L.A. UCLA (1984)	Multnomah County, OR (1984)	Baltimore (1983)	Cincin- nati (1986)	Massa- chusetts (1985)	Ohio (1984)	Detroit (1984-85)	Milwaukee (1984-85)	Multnomah County, OR (1985)	Chicago (1983)	Seattle (1986)
Sex - % Male	81	76	85	96	100	85	92	65	81	81	71	87	0	67	52
Race - % nonwhite	54	69	54	73	53	23	72	39	30	33	74	40	27	59	49
Age -															
% < 30	30	25	63 ^b	36	22	29	n.a.	29	48 ^b	35	(X=	31	67 ^b	43 ^b	49 ^k
% 31-50	51	55 ^c	37 ^e	45	55	48	n.a.	27 ^d	38 ^{ae}	44	35)	47	29 ^e	49 ^c	23 ^l
Marital Status															
% never married	55	57	53	99	57	40	60	n.a.	61	45	52	36	29	n.a.	n.a.
Education															
% H.S. Graduate or more	52	55	47	51	60	47	42	n.a.	52	44	43	n.a.	52	n.a.	n.a.
Length of Time Homeless															
% < 3 months	21	32	n.a.	55 ^f	36 ^f	33	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	49 ^g	n.a.	32 ^g	33	37 ^g	n.a.
% 3-12 months	47	39	n.a.	30	49	41	n.a.	13	n.a.	27	n.a.	28	41	28	
% > 12 months	19	13	n.a.	n.a.	17 ^h	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	8 ⁱ	n.a.	16 ⁱ	
Income Maintenance ^j															
% yes, now	20	35	n.a.	15	16	13	n.a.	24	37	24	n.a.	32	19	22	n.a.
Worked for Pay Last Month - % yes	25	39	36	32	20	18	n.a.	n.a.	25	25	12	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Respondents from:															
SK	X	--	X	X	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	--	--
SI	X	X	X	X	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	X	X	--	X
Street	--	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	X	X	--
N =	1704	722	339	379	107	131	271	801	282	979	75	237	190	80	351

Note:

- ^a - only 31% homeless
- ^b - 17-34
- ^c - 31-54
- ^d - 31-45
- ^e - 35-54
- ^f - < 6 months
- ^g - < 2 months
- ^h - > 5 years
- ⁱ - > 3 years
- ^j - AFDC, GA or SSI
- ^k - 18-44
- ^l - 45-64

SOURCES FOR SUPPORTING TABLE 1, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

- Chaiklin, Harris and Lipton, Marc. (1984) "Family Status and Soup Kitchen Use: Some Policy Considerations." Baltimore, MD: University of Maryland, School of Social Work. Paper presented at National Conference on Family Relations, October 24, 1984.
- Farr, Rodger K., Koegel, Paul and Burnam, Audrey. (1986) A Study of Homelessness and Mental Illness in the Skid Row Area of Los Angeles. Los Angeles, CA: Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health.
- King County Department of Planning and Community Development. (1986) Homelessness Revisited: 1986 Seattle-King County Emergency Shelter Study Update. Seattle, WA: King County Department of Planning and Community Development, Housing and Community Development Division.
- Mowbray, Carol T., Johnson, V.Sue, Solarz, Andrea and Combs, Claudia J. (1985). "Mental Health and Homelessness in Detroit: A Research Study." East Lansing, MI: Michigan Department of Mental Health.
- Mulkern, Virginia, Bradley, Valerie J., Spence, Rebecca, Allein, Susan and Oldham, John E. (1985) Homelessness Needs Assessment Study: Findings and Recommendations for the Massachusetts Department of Mental Health. Boston, MA: Human Services Research Institute.
- Multnomah County Social Service Division. (1984) "The Homeless Poor." Multnomah County (Portland), OR.
- Multnomah County Social Services Division. (1985) "Homeless Women." Multnomah County (Portland), OR.
- Piliavin, Irving, Michael Sosin and Herb Westerfelt. (1987) "Tracking the Homeless." Focus, 10(4), Winter 1987-1988, 20-25. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison Institute for Research on Poverty.
- Ropers, Richard and Robertson, Marjorie. (1984) "Basic Shelter Research Project." Los Angeles, CA: UCLA School of Public Health.
- Rosnow, Mark J., Shaw, Toni and Concord, Clare Stapleton. (1985) "A Study of Homeless Mentally Ill Persons in Milwaukee." Milwaukee, WI: Human Services Triangle, Inc.
- Rossi, Peter H., Fisher, Gene A. and Willis, Georgianna. (1986) The Condition of the Homeless in Chicago. Amherst, MA: Social and Demographic Research Institute, University of Massachusetts; Chicago, IL: National Opinion Research Center (NORC).
- Roth, Dee, Bean, Jerry, Just, Nancy and Saveanu, Traian. (1985) Homelessness in Ohio: A Study of People in Need. Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Mental Health, Office of Program Evaluation and Research.
- Task Force on Emergency Shelter. (1983) "Homelessness in Chicago." Chicago, IL: Task Force on Emergency Shelter, Social Services Task Force, Department of Human Services, City of Chicago.
- Woods, William K. and Burdell, Edward L. (1987) "Homelessness in Cincinnati." Cincinnati, OH: Applied Information Resources.

SUPPORTING TABLE 2, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

SINGLE-DAY AND 7-DAY ESTIMATES OF
SERVICE-USING HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS
AND OF THE CHILDREN HOMELESS WITH THEM,
FOR MARCH 1987,
IN CITIES OF 100,000 OR MORE

(N = 1704)

	<u>Period Covered by Estimate:</u>	
	<u>1 day</u>	<u>7 days</u>
<u>Estimates For Adults</u> <u>(Weighted)</u>		
Number	110,334	194,017
95% Confidence Interval	± 34,534	± 81,893
Range		
Low	75,800	112,124
High	144,868	275,910
<u>Estimates For Children</u> <u>(Weighted)</u>		
Number	26,009	34,653
95% Confidence Interval	± 562	± 647
Range		
Low	25,447	34,006
High	26,571	35,300
<u>Totals -- Adults and Children</u>	136,343	228,670

"N" refers to unweighted N's.

SUPPORTING TABLE 3, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

SEX, RACE AND AGE OF HOMELESS SERVICE USERS
(weighted percentages)

	Homeless Individuals Who:			
	<u>Only Use</u> <u>Soup Kitchens</u> (N = 223)	<u>Only Use</u> <u>Shelters</u> (N = 670)	<u>Use Both Shelters</u> <u>and Soup Kitchens</u> (N = 811)	<u>Total</u> <u>Sample</u> (N = 1704)
<u>Total Sample</u>	24	36	40	100
<u>Characteristic</u>				
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	93	68	84	81
Female	7	32	16	19
	100	100	100	100
<u>Race</u>				
Black	40	35	47	41
White (not Hispanic)	43	51	43	46
Hispanic	13	12	7	10
Other	0	2	3	3
	100	100	100	100
<u>Age</u>				
18-30	20	32	35	30
31-50	65	47	48	51
51-65	11	17	17	16
66+	4	3	0	3
	100	100	100	100

"N" refers to unweighted data. All percentages are based on weighted data.

SUPPORTING TABLE 4, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

COMPARISON OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SERVICE-USING
HOMELESS TO THE U.S. POPULATION RESIDING IN MSAs

	Percent of:	
	Service-using Homeless	U.S. Population in MSAs
<u>Sex</u>		
Male	81	49
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>		
Black	41	13
Hispanic	10	7
<u>Age*</u>		
18-24	14	19
24-44	58	39
44-64	25	27
65+	3	15
<u>Household Composition</u>		
1-person households	83	25
Families headed by women	80	15

Source: Service-using homeless: Urban Institute survey data, N = 1704, all percentages based on weighted data. U.S. Population in MSAs: Bureau of the Census, State and Metropolitan Area Data Book, 1986, Table A. The MSA population was selected for comparison because it is the best available source of national data for the urban population surveyed in the present study.

* These age breaks are those used by the Census, with percentages recalculated to include only the adult (over 17) population. They differ from those found in Table 4-1, which parallel the age breaks used in most studies of the homeless.

SUPPORTING TABLE 5, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

SERVICE USE PATTERNS OF HOMELESS ADULTS AND CHILDREN

Homeless Individuals Who:

Only Use Soup Kitchens (N = 260)	Only Use Shelters (N = 759)	Use Both Shelters and Soup Kitchens (N = 685)	Total Sample (N = 1704)
--	-----------------------------------	---	-------------------------------

Adults

1-day estimate

Number	27,735	42,552	40,047	110,334
Percent	25	39	36	100

7-day estimate

Number	57,144	62,552	74,320	194,017
Percent	29	32	38	100

Children

1-day estimate

Number	513	20,799	4,697	26,009
Percent	1	80	18	100

7-day estimate

Number	1,790	25,142	7,721	34,653
Percent	5	73	22	100

"N" refers to unweighted N's. The numbers in this table are weighted numbers (national estimates), and the percents are based on them. See Table 2 in this section for confidence intervals.

SUPPORTING TABLE 6, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION, MARITAL STATUS AND EDUCATION
OF THE SERVICE-USING HOMELESS, BY THEIR PATTERN OF SERVICE USE
(weighted percentages)

Homeless Individuals Who:

	Only Use Soup Kitchens (N = 223)	Only Use Shelters (N = 670)	Use Both Shelters and Soup Kitchens (N = 811)	Total Sample (N = 1704)
<u>Household Composition</u>				
Single Persons				
Males	83	64	79	75
Females	3	12	6	8
Families (Children Present)				
Female Headed	1	15	5	8
Other (2-Parent, or Male-Headed)	1	3	0	2
Other Household Types ^a	12	2	1	6
	100	100	100	100
<u>Marital Status</u>				
Currently married	18	7	9	10
Divorced/Separated	25	29	32	29
Widowed	3	10	3	5
Never Married	55	54	56	55
	100	100	100	100
<u>Education</u>				
Elementary (0-7)	16	9	5	9
Some HS (8-11)	49	32	40	39
High School Graduate	23	31	39	32
Some Post HS	8	19	13	14
College Graduate	3	9	2	5
Some Post College	0	1	1	1
	100	100	100	100

^aN refers to unweighted data. All percentages are based on weighted data.

SUPPORTING TABLE 7, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

CURRENT SOURCES OF INCOME AMONG THE
SERVICE-USING HOMELESS, BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS
(weighted percentages)

(N = 1704)

Percent Who Received Income From:

	Working	AFDC	GA	SSI	Food Stamps	Other Benefits ^a	Hand- outs	Other ^b
<u>Total Sample</u>	25	5	12	4	18	7	17	31
<u>Sex</u>								
Male	25	2	9	3	13	7	18	43
Female	18	17	28	8	37	6	9	32
<u>Race</u>								
Black	19	7	16	3	20	6	15	34
White	28	2	7	5	14	9	15	50
Hispanic	30	7	20	3	23	4	17	32
<u>Age</u>								
< 30	33	9	15	2	18	3	21	46
31-50	25	4	11	4	18	4	17	46
51-65	9	1	14	5	19	17	10	24
66+	12	0	0	19	3	65	1	2
<u>Homeless with Child</u>								
Yes	23	33	33	2	48	4	4	26
No	24	1	10	4	14	7	18	43
<u>Education</u>								
Less than 12 years	22	5	12	4	16	7	20	39
12 years or more	26	4	12	3	19	7	16	45

^a "N" refers to unweighted data. All percentages are based on weighted data.

^a SSDI, Social Security, veteran's benefits, workers' compensation, unemployment insurance.

^b Received money from relatives, friends, trading or swapping things, gifts, selling blood, other.

SUPPORTING TABLE 8, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

HISTORY OF HOMELESSNESS AND WORK AMONG THE
SERVICE-USING HOMELESS, BY PATTERN OF SERVICE USE
(weighted percentages)

Homeless Individuals Who:

	Only Use Soup Kitchens (N = 223)	Only Use Shelters (N = 670)	Use Both Shelters and Soup Kitchens (N = 811)	Total Sample (N = 1704)
<u>Length of Current Period of Homeless- ness</u>				
< 1 month	5	14	4	8
2-3 months	10	16	12	13
4-6 months	30	16	14	19
7-12 months	7	16	16	14
13-24 months	9	19	17	16
25-48 months	21	8	10	12
> 4 years	18	12	26	19
	100	100	100	100
Mean (in months)	37	33	44	39
Median (in months)	14	7	12	10
<u>Months Since Last Steady Job</u>				
< 1 month	0	4	1	2
2-3 months	4	12	7	8
4-6 months	12	15	15	14
7-12 months	12	15	19	16
13-24 months	13	16	14	14
25-48 months	13	7	18	13
> 4 years	45	32	26	33
	100	100	100	100
Mean (in months)	67	42	40	48
Median (in months)	26	17	21	21

"N" refers to unweighted data. All percentages are based on weighted data.

SUPPORTING TABLE 9, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

RESPONDENT PERCEPTIONS OF HEALTH STATUS

Source of Data					
Urban					
Institute	Rossi et al.	Farr, et al.	NCHS-national		
national	Chicago	Los Angeles		Low-	
(N=1704)	(N=350)	(N=322)	All	Income	

"Would you say
your health, in
general, now is:"

Excellent	14	18	22	38	28
Very Good	17	--	--	29	23
Good	35	46	30	24	28
Fair	25	25	36	7	
Poor	13	11	12	3	20
	100	100	100	100	100

"N" refers to unweighted data. Both the Urban Institute and the Chicago percentages are based on weighted data; the Los Angeles data are based on unweighted sample N's. The national statistics are projections to the U.S. adult population aged 18-64.

SOURCES: Rossi, Peter H., Fisher, Gene A. and Willis, Georgianna. The Condition of the Homeless in Chicago. Amherst, MA: Social and Demographic Research Institute, University of Massachusetts; Chicago, IL: National Opinion Research Center (NORC), 1986. Farr, Rodger K., Koegel, Paul and Burnam, Audrey. A Study of Homelessness and Mental Illness in the Skid Row Area of Los Angeles. Los Angeles, CA: Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health, 1986. National Center for Health Statistics. (1987b) Current Estimates from the National Health Interview Survey: United States 1986. Washington, DC: NCHS, Series 10, #164, for 1986 national data from the National Health Interview Survey, adults aged 18-64. National Center for Health Statistics. (1987a) Health United States: 1986. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, Table 39 for low-income population data from the 1985 National Health Interview Survey, covering all persons 4-86+.

SUPPORTING TABLE 10, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

PERCEPTIONS OF HEALTH AND REPORTED HEALTH PROBLEMS
(weighted percentages)

(N = 1704)

Number of Health Problems Reported

None	44
1 problem	31
2 problems	11
3 problems	8
4 or more problems	7
	<u>100</u>

Types of Health Problems Reported

None	44
Upper respiratory tract infections (Colds, coughs, bronchitis)	21
Arthritis, rheumatism, joint problems	15
High blood pressure	15
Problems walking, lost limb, etc.	10
Heart disease/stroke	8
Problems with the liver, jaundice	8
Anemia (poor blood)	6
Diabetes (sugar in the blood)	4
Pneumonia	4
Tuberculosis	2
Other health problems	19

Institutionalization History

Mental Hospitalization	19
Inpatient Treatment for Chemical Dependency	33
Jail for 5 or More Days	52
State or Federal Prison	24

All Institutionalizations
Combined - Percent with:

None	34
One	27
Two	21
Three	14
All four	4

"N" refers to unweighted data. All percentages are based on weighted data.

SUPPORTING TABLE 11, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

SLEEP/REST LOCATIONS USED BY SERVICE-USING HOMELESS PERSONS
DURING THE 7 NIGHTS PRECEDING THE INTERVIEW
(weighted percentages)

(N = 1704)

<u>Number of Nights</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents Reporting Nights Spent At:</u>		
	<u>Shelter^a</u>	<u>Street^b</u>	<u>Someone's Apartment^c</u>
0	24	63	78
1	24	2	4
2	5	2	7
3	5	2	2
4	3	5	1
5	3	3	3
6	2	5	1
7	34	18	4

"N" refers to unweighted data. All percentages are based on weighted data.

^a Shelters for the homeless.

^b Includes streets, parks, open areas, indoor public spaces, abandoned buildings.

^c Home or apartment of a family member, relative, friend, or someone else.

SUPPORTING TABLE 12, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

**REPORTED FREQUENCY OF EATING AMONG HOMELESS
SERVICE USERS, BY PATTERN OF SERVICE USE
(weighted percentages)**

Homeless Individuals Who:

<u>Question</u>	<u>Only Use Soup Kitchens (N = 223)</u>	<u>Only Use Shelters (N = 670)</u>	<u>Use Both Shelters and Soup Kitchens (N = 811)</u>	<u>Total Sample (N = 1704)</u>
"How many times do you usually eat in a day?"				
Less than once	21	1	3	7
Once	27	23	37	30
Twice	40	36	39	38
Three times	8	31	18	20
Four times	2	8	2	4
> four times	2	1	1	1
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
"During the last 7 days, did you go a whole day without eating? How often?"				
None	41	77	68	64
One	40	14	12	19
Two	13	4	10	9
Three	5	1	8	5
Four or more	1	4	2	3
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
"Ever go without any- thing to eat for two or more days at a time? How often?"				
Never	51	72	62	63
Few times a year	10	7	8	8
Once a month	3	5	9	6
Twice a month	9	4	6	6
Once a week	27	12	15	17
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

"N" refers to unweighted N's. All percentages are based on weighted data.

SUPPORTING TABLE 13, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

PERCENT OF SERVICE-USING HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS REPORTING
ABSENCE OF SPECIFIC FOOD GROUPS FROM THEIR DIET,
BY PATTERN OF SERVICE USE
(weighted percentages)

Homeless Individuals Who:

Only Use Soup Kitchens (N = 223)	Only Use Shelters (N = 670)	Use Both Shelters and Soup Kitchens (N = 811)	Total Sample (N = 1704)
--	-----------------------------------	---	-------------------------------

No Consumption of
Food Group During
Previous Day

Grain Products	44	23	25	30
Meat/Meat Alternates	19	17	24	20
Fruits/Vegetables	45	41	43	43
Milk/Milk Products	67	61	67	65
Miscellaneous Foods	50	31	31	36
No consumption of any food	8	11	4	8

"N" refers to unweighted N's. All percentages are based on weighted data.

SUPPORTING TABLE 14. DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

AMONG SERVICE-USING HOMELESS PERSONS
(weighted percentages)

(N = 1704)

Homeless Individuals Who:

Only Use Soup Kitchens (N = 223)	Only Use Shelters (N = 670)	Use Both Shelters and Soup Kitchens (N = 811)	Total Sample (N = 1704)
--	-----------------------------------	---	-------------------------------

"In general, would
you say the health-
fulness of your diet
is . . ."

Excellent	2	17	5	9
Very good	7	12	8	9
Good	27	34	30	31
Fair	31	23	31	28
Poor	33	14	25	23
	100	100	100	100

"N" refers to unweighted N's. Percentages are based on weighted data.

SUPPORTING TABLE 15, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

SERVICE-USING HOMELESS PERSONS'
PERCEPTIONS OF FOOD SUFFICIENCY
(weighted percentages)

(N = 1704)

	Respondents from:		
	Urban Institute		
	study		
	Service-	CSFII	
	Using	Households of	Households
	Homeless	All Incomes	<76% of Poverty
"Which of the following best describes your situation in terms of the food you eat?"			
Get enough of the kinds of food you want to eat	19*	70	31
Get enough but not always what you want to eat	43	27	49
Sometimes do not get enough to eat	19	3	15
Often do not get enough to eat	19	1	5
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

	Homeless Respondents (Urban Institute Study):	
	All Respondents	Respondents Saying Sometimes or Often Not Enough
"How often do you find that you do not have enough to eat?"		
Every day	15*	38*
Every other day	11	31
Two times a week	6	17
Once a week	4	9
Several times a month	2	4
Less often than several times a month	0	1
	38	100

"N" refers to unweighted N's from this study. All percentages in columns marked by an * are based on weighted data from the present study.

SOURCE: Mathematica Policy Research. (1987) Final Report for the Food and Nutrition Service, USDA: Descriptive Tables Based Upon Merged Wave 1 Data for the Core and Low-Income Samples of the 1985 CSFII. Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, Tables 3.1.1 and 3.1.3.

SUPPORTING TABLE 16, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

**TOTAL NUMBER OF SERVINGS OF ALL FOODS
EATEN ON THE DAY BEFORE THE INTERVIEW,
AS REPORTED BY SERVICE-USING HOMELESS RESPONDENTS,
BY PATTERN OF SERVICE USE**

Homeless Individuals Who:

<u>Only Use</u> <u>Soup Kitchens</u> <u>(N = 223)</u>	<u>Only Use</u> <u>Shelters</u> <u>(N = 670)</u>	<u>Use Both Shelters</u> <u>and Soup Kitchens</u> <u>(N = 811)</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Sample</u> <u>(N = 1704)</u>
---	--	--	--

Number of Servings

First Quartile (25% are lower)	3	7	5	5
Median (50% are lower)	6	10	8	9
Third Quartile (75% are lower)	9	14	13	13
Minimum	0	0	0	0
Maximum	25	41	68	68

USDA Recommendation* 15-25

"N" refers to unweighted N's. All figures are based on weighted data.

* SOURCE: Human Nutrition Information Service, USDA. (1986) "Nutrition and Your Health, Dietary Guidelines for Americans: Eat a Variety of Foods." Home and Garden Bulletin #232-1, April 1986, p.3.

SUPPORTING TABLE 17, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

PERCENT OF SERVICE-USING HOMELESS RESPONDENTS
WHO REPORT EATING FOODS FROM DIFFERENT FOOD GROUPS
BY PATTERN OF SERVICE USE
(weighted percentages)

	Homeless Individuals Who:			
	Only Use Soup Kitchens (N = 223)	Only Use Shelters (N = 670)	Use Both Shelters and Soup Kitchens (N = 811)	Total Sample (N = 1704)
<u>Number of Food Groups Reported Present in Diet from:</u>				
<u>5 Core Groups^a</u>				
No groups	8	12	12	11
1 group	9	6	8	8
2 groups	28	17	22	21
3 groups	41	27	31	32
4 groups	12	20	22	19
All 5 groups	2	18	5	9
	100	100	100	100
Median Number of Groups	3	3	3	3
<u>Additional 5 Groups^b</u>				
No groups	42	25	25	29
1 group	38	29	33	33
2 groups	17	26	28	24
3 groups	3	17	9	11
4 groups	0	3	5	3
All 5 groups	0	0	0	0
	100	100	100	100
Median number of groups	1	1	1	1

"N" refers to unweighted N's. All percentages are based on weighted data. Due to rounding errors, all percentages do not sum to 100%.

^a milk and milk products, grain products, fruits and fruit juices, vegetables, and meats and meat alternates.

^b fats and oils, baked goods, sweets, sweetened beverages and salty snacks.

SUPPORTING TABLE 18, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

AVERAGE NUMBER OF SERVINGS PER FOOD GROUP IN ONE-DAY FOOD LISTS
REPORTED BY SERVICE USING HOMELESS PERSONS

(N = 1704)

<u>Food Group</u>	<u>Average Number of Servings</u>	
	<u>Homeless Service Users</u>	<u>USDA Recommendations*</u>
Milk and Milk Products	.8	2
Grain Products	1.7	6-11
Fruits and Fruit Juices	.5	2-4
Vegetables	1.1	3-5
Meat and Meat Alternates	2.3	2-3
Fats and Oils	.4	N/A
Baked Goods	.5	N/A
Candy	.5	N/A
Sweetened Drinks	1.2	N/A
Salty Snacks	.1	N/A

"N" refers to unweighted N's. All figures taken from interviews with homeless individuals are based on weighted data.

* SOURCE: Human Nutrition Information Service, USDA. (1986) "Nutrition and Your Health, Dietary Guidelines for Americans: Eat a Variety of Foods." Home and Garden Bulletin #232-1, April 1986, p.3.

SUPPORTING TABLE 19, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS' DAILY INTAKE
FROM GRAINS, MEATS, VEGETABLES AND FRUITS, MILK, MISCELLANEOUS FOOD
(weighted percentages)

(N = 1704)

Average Percentage of
Total Daily Intake

Food Group

Grain Products	20
Meat and Meat Alternates	28
Vegetables and Fruits	17
Milk and Milk Products	8
Miscellaneous Food	24

"N" refers to unweighted N's. Percentages are based on weighted data.

SUPPORTING TABLE 20, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS
 PERCENTAGE OF HOMELESS RESPONDENTS USING 9 FOOD SOURCES
 DURING 7 DAYS PRECEDING THE INTERVIEW,
 BY NUMBER OF DAYS THE SOURCE WAS USED
 (weighted percentages)

(N = 1704)

<u>Source</u>	Number of Days Source Was Used:							
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Soup kitchen	36	18	9	5	5	5	5	18
Shelter where you live	49	6	5	5	2	2	2	30
Food pantry	95	3	1	1	0	0	0	0
Food wagon	95	2	1	1	1	0	0	0
Relative's or friend's	82	4	5	4	1	2	0	2
Grocery store	81	4	6	3	1	1	0	4
Restaurant, for pay	71	8	10	3	2	1	1	4
Restaurant, back door	92	3	2	1	0	0	0	1
Trash can	91	3	3	2	1	0	0	0

"N" refers to unweighted N's. All percentages are based on weighted data.

SUPPORTING TABLE 21, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF HOMELESS ADULT MEMBERS
OF FAMILIES, COMPARED TO HOMELESS SINGLE ADULTS^a
(weighted percentages)

Characteristic	Homeless Adults Who Are:	
	In Homeless Families ^a [Households with Child(ren)]	Homeless by Themselves
	(N = 296)	(N = 1408)
Male	12	88
Female	88	12
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Race</u>		
Black	54	39
White (not Hispanic)	22	49
Hispanic	20	9
Other	4	3
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Marital Status</u>		
Currently married	23	9
Divorced/Separated	25	30
Widowed	6	6
Never Married	47	56
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Where Lived Before Becoming Homeless</u>		
House	31	31
Apartment	61	38
Room	4	22
Other ^b	4	9
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Number of Months Homeless:</u>		
Mean	14.6	41.3
Median	4.5	12.0
<u>Number of Months Without Steady Job</u>		
Mean	43.4	48.3
Median	19.5	20.0

^a "N" refers to unweighted data. All percentages are based on weighted data.

^a In this study, any homeless household that includes at least one child is referred to as a "family."

^b Usually, an institution such as a mental hospital, halfway house, jail or prison, detoxification center or other treatment program.

SUPPORTING TABLE 22, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

RESOURCES OF HOMELESS ADULT MEMBERS OF FAMILIES,
COMPARED TO HOMELESS SINGLE ADULTS^a
(weighted percentages)

Resource	Homeless Adults Who Are:	
	In Homeless Families ^a [Households with Child(ren)] (N = 296)	Homeless by Themselves (N = 1408)
<u>Food Stamp Receipt:</u>		
Nov	50	15
Before but not now	32	42
Never received	19	43
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Got Cash Last Month From:</u>		
Working	23	25
AFDC	33	1
General Assistance	33	10
<u>Cash Income Last Month:</u>		
Mean	\$301	\$146
Median	\$300	\$ 64
<u>Past 7 Days, Number of Nights Spent in Shelters:</u>		
None	4	27
1	13	25
2-6	17	17
7	66	31
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Past 7 Days, Number of Days Got Meals from Shelter Where You Live:</u>		
None	43	50
1	3	6
2-6	18	15
7	36	29
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Past 7 Days, Number of Days Got Meals from Soup Kitchens:</u>		
None	69	32
1	15	18
2-6	8	31
7	8	19
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

^a"N" refers to unweighted N's. All percentages are based on weighted data.

^a In this study, any homeless household that includes at least one child is referred to as a "family."

SUPPORTING TABLE 23, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

PERCEPTIONS OF DIET AMONG HOMELESS ADULT MEMBERS
OF FAMILIES, COMPARED TO HOMELESS SINGLE ADULTS^a
(weighted percentages)

Homeless Adults Who Are:

Question	In Homeless Families ^a [Households with Child(ren)]	Homeless by Themselves
	(N = 296)	(N = 1408)
"In general, would you say the healthfulness of your diet is ... "		
Excellent	8	9
Very good	7	10
Good	41	29
Fair	29	28
Poor	15	24
	100	100
"Which of the following best describes your situation in terms of the food you eat?"		
Get enough of the kinds of food you want to eat	26	19
Get enough but not always what you want to eat	45	42
Sometimes do not get enough to eat	16	20
Often do not get enough to eat	13	19
	100	100

"N" refers to unweighted data. All percentages are based on weighted data.

^a In this study, any homeless household that includes at least one child is referred to as a "family."

SUPPORTING TABLE 24, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

REPORTED FREQUENCY OF EATING AMONG HOMELESS ADULT
MEMBERS OF FAMILIES, COMPARED TO HOMELESS SINGLE ADULTS^a
(weighted percentages)

Question	Homeless Adults Who Are:	
	In Homeless Families ^a [Households with Child(ren)] (N = 296)	Homeless by Themselves (N = 1408)
"How many times do you usually eat in a day?"		
Less than once	1	8
Once	19	31
Twice	39	38
Three times	32	20
Four times	8	4
> four times	1	1
	100	100
"During the last 7 days, did you go a whole day without eating? How often?"		
None	84	62
One	9	21
Two	5	9
Three	1	5
Four or more	1	4
	100	100
"Ever go without anything to eat for two or more days at a time? How often?"		
Never	79	61
Few times a year	13	8
Once a month	2	7
Twice a month	1	6
Once a week	5	18
	100	100
<u>Contents of Diet on Day Before Being Interviewed:</u>		
<u>Number of Servings of All Foods:</u>		
Mean	8.5	9.1
Median	7.2	7.2
<u>Number of 5 Core Food Groups:</u>		
Mean	2.9	2.6
Median	2.5	2.3

^a"N" refers to unweighted N's. All percentages are based on weighted data.

^a In this study, any homeless household that includes at least one child is referred to as a "family."

SUPPORTING TABLE 25, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY HOMELESS ADULT MEMBERS
OF FAMILIES, COMPARED TO HOMELESS SINGLE ADULTS^a
(weighted percentages)

Problem	Homeless Adults Who Are:	
	In Homeless Families ^a [Households with Child(ren)] (N = 296)	Homeless by Themselves (N = 1408)
<u>History of:</u>		
Mental Hospitalization	11	20
Inpatient Treatment for Chemical Dependency	12	35
Percent with Neither	84	54
Percent with Either	10	37
Percent with Both	7	9
	100	100
<u>Current Level of Depression/ Demoralization:^b</u>		
Mean	17.5	16.6
Median	18.0	15.0
<u>Criminal Justice Involvement:</u>		
Jail for 5 Days or More:	18	56
State or Federal Prison:	2	26
Percent with Neither	82	40
Percent with Either	16	38
Percent with Both	2	22
	100	100
<u>All Institutionalizations Combined -- Percent with:</u>		
None	76	29
One	12	29
Two	6	22
Three	6	15
All Four	0	5
	100	100

"N" refers to unweighted N's. All percentages are based on weighted data.

^a In this study, any homeless household that includes at least one child is referred to as a "family."

^b As measured by the Depression Scale developed by the Center for Epidemiological Studies, NIMH, known as the CES-D. A score of 16 or higher indicates need for immediate clinical attention.

SUPPORTING TABLE 26, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH FREQUENCY OF EATING
REPORTED BY SERVICE-USING HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS
(standardized regression coefficients)

(N = 1704)

Independent Variables	Dependent Variable: ^a		
	Daily	No Eat	Two Days
Current depression/demoralization (CES-D - high = more)	-.135**	.240****	.139*
Gender (1=female 0=male)	-.171*	-.312***	.311**
Homeless household includes child	.507***	.003	-.258*
Reported number of health problems	-.226***	-.187**	-.029
Days/week eat at shelter	.151**	-.052	-.068
Drug/alcohol trtmt. (1=yes; 0=no)	-.110	.280****	.068
Single (1=yes; 0=no)	.060	-.405****	.143
Food stamp benefit received - \$ per person/month (range=\$0-\$81)	.162**	.048	.064
Months of homelessness	.117*	-.097	.022
Months since last steady job	-.003	.015	.132*
Education	.063	-.118*	-.035
Age	-.061	.111	-.168*
Reported income/last 30 days	.075	-.055	-.101
Minority status (1=yes; 0=no)	.061	.037	.030
Has a place to cook food	-.087	-.015	.014
Receives income maintenance now	-.033	-.093	-.012
Mental hospitaliza. (1=yes; 0=no)	.085	.030	-.083
Number of servings of alcohol	.019	-.043	.111
Adjusted R ²	.373	.282	.148

^a"N" refers to unweighted N's. Regressions are based on weighted data.

- ^a "Daily" = number of times the respondent eats daily; higher = more.
 "Noeat" = number of days without eating during past week; higher = more.
 "Twodays" = frequency of going two days without eating; higher = more.

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001; **** p < .0001

SUPPORTING TABLE 27, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH DIETARY INTAKE
REPORTED BY SERVICE-USING HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS
(standardized regression coefficients)

(N = 1704)

	Dependent Variable:		
	Number of Servings (0-68)	Number of Five Core Food Groups (0-5)	Number of Additional Food Groups (0-4)
Range =			
<u>Independent Variables</u>			
Number of days ate at shelter	.144*	.145*	.113
Receives income maintenance now	.154*	.081	.230**
Food stamp benefit received - \$ per person/month (range=\$0-\$81)	.208**	.213**	.084
Months of homelessness	.145*	.252***	.067
Minority status (1=yes; 0=no)	-.156**	-.093	-.130*
Gender (1=female; 0=male)	.170	-.081	.296**
Age	-.219**	-.074	-.014
Has a place to cook food	-.162*	-.109	-.070
Months since last steady job	.041	.022	-.148*
Number of reported health problems	-.095	-.149*	.082
Current depression/demoralization (CES-D - high = more)	-.063	-.040	-.028
Mental hospitaliza. (1=yes; 0=no)	-.014	-.031	-.015
Number of servings of alcohol	-.041	-.064	-.102
Education	-.109	-.061	.006
Reported income/last 30 days	.043	.039	-.010
Single (1=yes; 0=no)	.046	-.070	.191
Homeless household includes child	.034	.067	-.003
Drug/alcohol trtmt. (1=yes; 0=no)	.041	-.090	-.018
Adjusted R ²	.228	.258	.200

"N" refers to unweighted N's. Regressions are based on weighted data.

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

SUPPORTING TABLE 28, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

COMPARISON OF DEMOGRAPHIC AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS:
NON-USER HOMELESS AND SERVICE-USING HOMELESS
(percentages)

<u>Characteristic</u>		<u>Non-Users (N = 142)^a</u>	<u>Users (N = 1704)^b</u>
Sex -- % Male		89	81
Race -- Black		54	41
White (not Hispanic)		34	46
Hispanic		9	10
Other		3	3
		<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Age -- 18-30		21	30
31-50		55	51
51-65		21	16
> 65		3	3
		<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Marital Status -- % Never Married		49	55
Education -- % High School Graduate		45	52
Length of Time Homeless --	< 1 mo	5	8
	2-3 mo	9	13
	4-6 mo	8	19
	7-12 mo	16	14
	13-24 mo	15	16
	25-48 mo	17	12
	> 48 mo	31	19
		<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Length of Time/Last Steady Job --	< 1 mo	1	2
	2-3 mo	5	8
	4-6 mo	5	14
	7-12 mo	15	16
	13-24 mo	14	14
	25-48 mo	20	13
	> 48 mo	40	33
		<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Income Maintenance -- % Receiving		9	20
Food Stamp Receipt -- % Now		9	18
	% Before	32	41
	% Never	59	41

a. No weight possible for non-users. Percents based on unweighted N's.

b. Percents based on veighted N's, as the best estimate for service users.

SUPPORTING TABLE 27, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH DIETARY INTAKE
REPORTED BY SERVICE-USING HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS
(standardized regression coefficients)

(N = 1704)

Range =	Dependent Variable:		
	Number of Servings (0-68)	Number of Five Core Food Groups (0-5)	Number of Additional Food Groups (0-4)

Independent Variables

Number of days ate at shelter	.144*	.145*	.113
Receives income maintenance now	.154*	.081	.230**
Food stamp benefit received - \$ per person/month (range=\$0-\$81)	.208**	.213**	.084
Months of homelessness	.145*	.252***	.067
Minority status (1=yes; 0=no)	-.156**	-.093	-.130*
Gender (1=female; 0=male)	.170	-.081	.296**
Age	-.219**	-.074	-.014
Has a place to cook food	-.162*	-.109	-.070
Months since last steady job	.041	.022	-.148*
Number of reported health problems	-.095	-.149*	.082
Current depression/demoralization (CES-D - high = more)	-.063	-.040	-.028
Mental hospitaliza. (1=yes; 0=no)	-.014	-.031	-.015
Number of servings of alcohol	-.041	-.064	-.102
Education	-.109	-.061	.006
Reported income/last 30 days	.043	.039	-.010
Single (1=yes; 0=no)	.046	-.070	.191
Homeless household includes child	.034	.067	-.003
Drug/alcohol trtmt. (1=yes; 0=no)	.041	-.090	-.018
Adjusted R ²	.228	.258	.200

"N" refers to unweighted N's. Regressions are based on weighted data.

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

SUPPORTING TABLE 30, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

COMPARISON OF FOOD AND NUTRITION DATA:
NON-USER HOMELESS AND SERVICE-USING HOMELESS
(percentages)

<u>Food Sources</u>		Non-Users (N = 142) ^a	Users (N = 1704) ^b
(Mean proportion of time food is obtained from:			
Providers		2	76
Purchase (grocery, restaurant)		20	12
Friends, Relatives, Handouts		29	6
Trash Cans		35	1
Other		14	5
		<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Times Eat, Per Day</u>	--		
	< 1	15	7
	1	51	30
	2	27	38
	3	6	20
	> 3	1	5
		<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Number of Days in Last 7 Days Without Food</u>			
	0	39	64
	1	23	19
	2	21	9
	3	11	5
	4 or more	7	3
		<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Description of Diet</u>			
	Get enough of what want to eat	6	19
	Get enough, but not what want	25	43
	Sometimes do not get enough	30	19
	Often do not get enough	40	19
		<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Quality of Diet</u>	-- % fair	39	28
	% poor	39	23
<u>No Consumption of Food Group During Previous Day</u>			
	Grains	42	30
	Meats or Meat Alternates	37	20
	Vegetables/Fruits	67	43
	Milk and Milk Products	85	65
	Miscellaneous Food	43	36
<u>No Consumption At All During Previous Day</u>		13	8

a. No weight possible for non-users. Percents based on unweighted N's.

b. Percents based on weighted N's, as the best estimate for service users.

SUPPORTING TABLE 29, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

COMPARISON OF HEALTH, MENTAL HEALTH AND INSTITUTIONALIZATIONS:
NON-USER HOMELESS AND SERVICE-USING HOMELESS
(percentages)

Characteristic	Non-Users (N = 142) ^a	Users (N = 1704) ^b
Health Problems -- None	39	44
1	26	31
2	16	11
3	10	8
4 or more	8	7
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Health Status -- % Fair or Poor	57	38
Mental Health Indicators		
% Ever Attempted Suicide	31	21
% At or Above CES-D Cutoff of 16	70	49
% with History of Mental Hospitalization	27	19
Institutionalization		
Incarceration in Jail or Prison		
None	35	44
One	41	36
Both	24	20
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Mental Illness or Chemical Dependency		
Residential Treatment		
None	47	57
One	37	34
Both	16	9
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
% With No Institutionalizations	28	34

a. No weight possible for non-users. Percents based on unweighted N's.

b. Percents based on weighted N's, as the best estimate for service users.

SUPPORTING TABLE 31, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

COMPARING NEW YORK TO NON-NEW YORK RESPONDENTS, ALL RESPONDENTS COMBINED
[weighted percentages (%) and means (M)]

	NEW YORK N = 222	OTHER CITIES N = 1482	ALL N=1704
With child (%)	22	8	10
% female	34	17	20
% < HS	58	46	48
Never married (%)	75	51	55
White (%)	13	52	46
Food stamps - Now (%)	34	15	18
- Before (%)	33	43	41
FS per person in household (M)	\$29	\$63	\$52
% spending no days in shelter	20	25	24
% spending 7 days in shelter	50	31	34
\$ from AFDC (%)	9	4	5
\$ from GA (%)	30	9	12
\$ from working (%)	10	28	25
Diet - Fair (%)	30	28	28
- Poor (%)	29	22	23
Situa - Sometimes not enough/eat	19	19	19
- Often not enough/eat (%)	19	19	19
# times eat daily (M)	1.8	1.9	1.9
NOEATWK = none (%)	73	63	64
TWODAYS = none (%)	71	61	63
Number of servings (M)	7.6	9.4	9.1
Core 5 food groups (M)	2.2	2.8	2.7
Additional food groups (M)	1.0	1.3	1.3
\$ last month (M)	\$253	\$147	\$162
\$ per person last month (M)	\$186	\$129	\$137
# months homeless (M)	47.8	36.8	38.5
# days eat at soup kitchen (M)	2.9	2.4	2.5
# days eat at shelter (M)	2.2	2.8	2.7
Depression/demoralization (M)	19.4	16.2	16.7
Mental hospitalization (%)	22	18	19
Drug/alcohol treatment (%)	35	32	33
Time in jail (%)	48	53	52
Time in prison (%)	30	23	24
# types of institu. - 0 (%)	35	34	34
- 1 (%)	29	27	27
- 2 (%)	14	22	21
- 3 (%)	13	14	14
- 4 (%)	9	3	4

*"N" refers to unweighted N's. All figures are based on weighted data.

SUPPORTING TABLE 32, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

COMPARING NEW YORK TO NON-NEW YORK RESPONDENTS
RESPONDENTS WITH CHILDREN ONLY

[weighted percentages (%) and means (M)]

	NEW YORK N = 76	OTHER CITIES N = 220	ALL N = 296
% female	100	82	88
% < HS	67	43	51
Never married (%)	60	40	47
White (%)	6	31	22
Food stamps - Now (%)	86	31	50
- Before (%)	12	42	32
FS per person in household (M)	\$29	\$44	\$35
% spending no days in shelter	1	5	4
% spending 7 days in shelter	95	50	66
\$ from AFDC (%)	38	31	33
\$ from GA (%)	65	16	33
\$ from working (%)	3	33	23
Diet - Fair (%)	29	28	29
- Poor (%)	22	12	15
Situa - Sometimes not enough/eat	14	17	16
- Often not enough/eat (%)	18	11	13
EATDAILY (M)	2.3	2.3	2.3
NOEATWK = none (%)	84	83	84
TWODAYS = none (%)	82	78	79
Number of servings (M)	7.2	9.2	8.5
Core 5 food groups (M)	2.6	3.1	2.9
Additional food groups (M)	1.1	1.5	1.3
\$ last month (M)	\$422	\$238	\$301
\$ per person last month (M)	\$182	\$ 83	\$117
# kids (M)	2.4	1.8	2.0
# months homeless (M)	19.2	12.1	14.6
# days eat at soup kitchen (M)	0.8	1.1	1.0
# days eat at shelter (M)	1.8	4.1	3.3
Depression/demoralization (M)	18.7	16.9	17.5
Mental hospitalization (%)	11%	11%	11%
Drug/alcohol treatment (%)	13	11	12
Time in jail (%)	20	17	18
Time in prison (%)	0	3	2
# types of institu. - 0 (%)	75	76	76
- 1 (%)	13	11	12
- 2 (%)	6	6	6
- 3 (%)	6	7	6
- 4 (%)	0	0	0

N refers to unweighted N's. All figures are based on weighted data.

SUPPORTING TABLE 33, DATA FROM HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS
COMPARING NEW YORK TO NON-NEW YORK RESPONDENTS,
RESPONDENTS WITHOUT CHILDREN ONLY
[weighted percentages (%) and means (M)]

	NEW YORK N = 146	OTHER CITIES N = 1262	ALL N = 1408
% female	16	11	12
% < HS	55	47	42
Never married (%)	79	52	56
White (%)	15	54	49
Food stamps - Now (%)	19	14	15
- Before (%)	39	43	42
FS per person in household (M)	\$29	\$67	\$59
% spending no days in shelter (%)	25	27	27
% spending 7 days in shelter (%)	38	30	31
\$ from AFDC (%)	0	1	1
\$ from GA (%)	21	8	10
\$ from working (%)	12	27	25
Diet - Fair (%)	30	28	28
- Poor (%)	31	23	24
Situa - Sometimes not enough/eat	20	20	20
- Often not enough/eat (%)	19	19	19
EATDAILY (M)	1.7	1.9	1.9
NOEATWK = none (%)	69	61	62
TWODAYS = none (%)	67	60	61
Number of servings (M)	7.8	9.3	9.1
Core 5 food groups (M)	2.1	2.7	2.6
Additional food groups (M)	1.0	1.3	1.2
\$ last month (M)	\$193	\$139	\$146
\$ per person last month (M)	\$187	\$133	\$140
# months homeless (M)	55.9	38.9	41.3
# days eat at soup kitchen (M)	3.5	2.5	2.7
# days eat at shelter (M)	2.3	2.6	2.6
Depression/demoralization (M)	19.6	16.1	16.6
Mental hospitalization (%)	25%	19%	20
Drug/alcohol treatment (%)	41	34	35
Time in jail (%)	53	57	56
Time in prison (%)	39	24	26
# types of institu. - 0 (%)	24	30	29
- 1 (%)	34	28	29
- 2 (%)	16	23	22
- 3 (%)	15	15	15
- 4 (%)	12	4	5

"N" refers to unweighted N's. All figures are based on weighted data.

SUPPORTING TABLES DOCUMENTING PATTERNS OF
RECEIPT AND USE OF FOOD STAMPS BY HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

The following four tables provide supporting evidence about homeless persons' receipt and use of food stamps. The first table shows characteristics associated with current receipt of food stamps, indicating that receiving income maintenance (from either AFDC, GA or SSI) and having a mailing address are the factors most strongly associated with current receipt of food stamps among homeless households. The second table indicates the ways that homeless individuals use their food stamps. Since households with mailing addresses are more likely to get food stamps, the third table explores which homeless households have a mailing address, which do not, and whether or not they are food stamp recipients. The final table looks at whether or not homeless households have a place to cook food, and how this differs by whether they do or do not get food stamps and whether or not they are a homeless household with a child.

INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS ASSOCIATED
WITH CURRENT RECEIPT OF FOOD STAMPS:
BINOMIAL LOGISTICAL REGRESSION RESULTS

(N = 1704)

<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Binomial Logistical Regression Coefficient</u>
Receives income maintenance now	.455***
Has a mailing address	.109***
Drug or alcohol institutionalization (1=yes; 0=no)	.082**
Minority status (1=yes; 0=no)	.047*
Homeless household includes children	.087
Has a place to cook food	-.036
Reported income for last 30 days	-.000
Age	.001
Education	.009
Gender (0=male; 1=female)	-.007
Single-person household	-.059
Length of time homeless	-.000
Length of time since last steady job	-.002
Adjusted CES-D (current depression/ demoralization)	-.009
Mental hospitalization (1=yes; 0=no)	-.043
Number of days ate at shelter	-.046
Number of servings of alcohol	-.004
Number of reported health problems	.002

Log-likelihood = -494.76, Chi-Squared = 370.70, $p < .0001$

*** $p < .0001$

** $p < .001$

* $p < .05$

SUPPORTING TABLE 2, FOOD STAMP USE AND RECEIPT

FOOD STAMP USE AMONG THE HOMELESS
(weighted percentages)

(N = 1704)

Homeless Individuals Who Received Food Stamps:

	<u>At Time of Survey</u> <u>(18% of total)</u>	<u>In The Past</u> <u>(42% of total)</u>
<u>Reported Uses of</u> <u>Food Stamps</u>		
Buy food at grocery stores	84	96
Purchase meals at restaurants	13	1
Stamps go directly to residential program	14	7
Sell them for cash	6	17
Stamps get lost or stolen	6	10
Other	3	1

"N" refers to unweighted data. All percentages are based on weighted data. Percents sum to more than 100 due to multiple responses.

SUPPORTING TABLE 3, FOOD STAMP USE AND RECEIPT

HOMELESS HOUSEHOLDS REPORTING A MAILING ADDRESS,
BY PSP PROGRAM STATUS, PRESENCE OF A CHILD,
AND TYPE OF SERVICE THEY USE
(weighted percentages)

(N = 1704)

Homeless Individuals Who:

Only Use Soup Kitchens	Only Use Shelters	Use Both Shelters and Soup Kitchens	Total Sample
(N = 260)	(N = 759)	(N = 685)	(N = 1704)

Percent with Mailing Address

Current Food Stamp
Recipients (N=415)

All Households Currently Receiving	68	77	87	85
Households With A Child	--a	86	92	88
Households Without a Child	67	70	85	77

Not Currently Receiving
Food Stamps (N=1289)

All Households Not Currently Receiving	33	56	50	47
Households With a Child	3	64	66	61
Households Without a Child	33	55	49	46
<u>All Homeless Households</u>	35	61	57	53

"N" refers to unweighted N's. All percentages are based on weighted data.

a Cell size too small for analysis.

SUPPORTING TABLE 4, FOOD STAMP USE AND RECEIPT

HOMELESS HOUSEHOLDS REPORTING A PLACE TO COOK FOOD,
BY PSP PROGRAM STATUS, PRESENCE OF A CHILD,
AND TYPE OF SERVICE THEY USE
(weighted percentages).

(N = 1704)

Homeless Individuals Who:

<u>Only Use</u> <u>Soup Kitchens</u>	<u>Only Use</u> <u>Shelters</u>	<u>Use Both Shelters</u> <u>and Soup Kitchens</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Sample</u>
(N = 260)	(N = 759)	(N = 685)	(N = 1704)

Percent with Place to Cook Food

Current Food Stamp
Recipients (N = 415)

All Households Currently Receiving	42	50	29	40
Households With A Child	-- ^a	87	74	84
Households Without a Child	39	20	21	23

Not Currently Receiving
Food Stamps (N = 1289)

All Households Currently Not Receiving	37	28	30	32
Households With A Child	-- ^a	49	36	48
Households Without a Child	37	26	30	30
<u>All Homeless Households</u>	38	34	30	32

^aN refers to unweighted N's. All percentages are based on weighted data.

PART 2

**SUPPLEMENTARY STATISTICAL AND
METHODOLOGICAL DOCUMENTATION**

SECTION A

**HOMELESS ELIGIBILITY CLARIFICATION
ACT OF 1986 (P.L. 99-570)**

**FINAL REGULATIONS GOVERNING PURCHASE
OF PREPARED MEALS BY HOMELESS
FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS**

SEC. 10001. PROHIBITION OF POSSESSION, MANUFACTURE, SALE, AND IMPORTATION OF BALLISTIC KNIVES.

The Act entitled "An Act to prohibit the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into interstate commerce of switchblade knives, and for other purposes" (15 U.S.C. 1232 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

15 USC 1241.

15 USC 1245.

"Sec. 7. (a) Whoever knowingly possesses, manufactures, sells, or imports a ballistic knife shall be fined as provided in title 18, United States Code, or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

"(b) Whoever possesses or uses a ballistic knife in the commission of a Federal or State crime of violence shall be fined as provided in title 18, United States Code, or imprisoned not less than five years and not more than ten years, or both.

"(c) The exceptions provided in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 4 with respect to switchblade knives shall apply to ballistic knives under subsection (a) of this section.

"(d) As used in this section, the term 'ballistic knife' means a knife with a detachable blade that is propelled by a spring-operated mechanism."

SEC. 10002. NONMAILABILITY OF BALLISTIC KNIVES.

Section 1716 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after subsection (h) and before the first undesignated paragraph after such subsection the following:

"(1)(1) Any ballistic knife shall be subject to the same restrictions and penalties provided under subsection (g) for knives described in the first sentence of that subsection.

"(2) As used in this subsection, the term 'ballistic knife' means a knife with a detachable blade that is propelled by a spring-operated mechanism."

15 USC 1245
note

SEC. 10003. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall take effect 30 days after the date of enactment of this title.

TITLE XI—HOMELESS ELIGIBILITY CLARIFICATION ACT

SEC. 11001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Homeless Eligibility Clarification Act".

Subtitle A—Emergency Food for the Homeless

SEC. 11002. MEALS SERVED TO HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS.

(a) **DEFINITION OF FOOD.**—Section 3(g) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2012(g)) is amended—

(1) in clause (1), by striking out "and (8)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(8), and (9)";

(2) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (7); and

(3) by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and (9) in the case of households that do not reside in permanent dwellings and households that have no fixed mailing addresses, meals prepared for and served by a public or private nonprofit establishment (approved by an appropriate State or local agency) that feeds such individuals and by a public or private nonprofit shelter (approved by an appropriate State or local agency) in which such households temporarily

Homeless
Eligibility
Clarification
Act.
7 USC 2011 note.

reside (except that such establishments and shelters may only request voluntary use of food stamps by such individuals and may not request such households to pay more than the average cost of the food contained in a meal served by the establishment or shelter)".

(b) **DEFINITION OF HOUSEHOLD.**—The last sentence of section 3(i) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2012(i)) is amended by inserting after "battered women and children," the following: "residents of public or private nonprofit shelters for individuals who do not reside in permanent dwellings or have no fixed mailing addresses, who are otherwise eligible for coupons,".

(c) **DEFINITION OF RETAIL FOOD STORE.**—Section 3(k)(2) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2012(k)(2)) is amended by striking "and (8)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(8), and (9)".

(d) **PARTICIPATION OF ESTABLISHMENTS AND SHELTERS.**—Section 9 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2018) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) In an area in which the Secretary, in consultation with the Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture, finds evidence that the participation of an establishment or shelter described in section 3(g)(9) damages the program's integrity, the Secretary shall limit the participation of such establishment or shelter in the food stamp program, unless the establishment or shelter is the only establishment or shelter serving the area."

(e) **REDEMPTION OF COUPONS.**—The first sentence of section 10 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2019) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" after "battered women and children,"; and

(2) by inserting after "blind residents" the following: ", and public or private nonprofit establishments, or public or private nonprofit shelters that feed individuals who do not reside in permanent dwellings and individuals who have no fixed mailing addresses".

(f)(1) The amendments made by this section shall become effective, and be implemented by issuance of final regulations, not later than April 1, 1987.

(2) Not later than September 30, 1988, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that evaluates the program established by the amendments made by this section, including any proposed legislative recommendations.

(3) The amendments made by this section shall cease to be effective after September 30, 1990.

Subtitle B—Job Training for the Homeless

SEC. 11001. JOB TRAINING FOR THE HOMELESS.

(a) **GOVERNOR'S COORDINATION AND SPECIAL SERVICES PLAN TO INCLUDE HOMELESS.**—(1) Section 121(b)(1) of the Job Training Partnership Act (20 USC 1531(b)(1)) is amended by inserting after "rehabilitation agencies" a comma and the following: "programs for the homeless".

(2) Section 121(c)(3) of the Job Training Partnership Act is amended by inserting after "offenders" a comma and the following: "homeless individuals".

Effective date
Regulations
7 USC 2012 note
Report

20 USC 1511

Rules and Regulations

Federal Register

Vol. 53, No. 126

Thursday, June 30, 1988

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains regulatory documents having general applicability and legal effect, most of which are keyed to and codified in the Code of Federal Regulations, which is published under 50 titles pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 1510. The Code of Federal Regulations is sold by the Superintendent of Documents. Prices of new books are listed in the first FEDERAL REGISTER issue of each week.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Food and Nutrition Service

CFR Parts 271, 272, 273, 274, and 278

(Amdt. No. 304)

Food Stamp Program: Purchase of Prepared Meals by Homeless Food Stamp Recipients

AGENCY: Food and Nutrition Service, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule and technical amendments.

SUMMARY: On March 11, 1987, the Department published an interim rulemaking at 52 FR 7554 which provided that effective not later than April 1, 1987, homeless food stamp recipients (including newly eligible residents of temporary shelters for the homeless) may use their food stamps to purchase prepared meals served by an authorized public or private nonprofit establishment, approved by an appropriate State or local agency, that feeds homeless persons. The rulemaking was based upon the provisions of the Homeless Eligibility Clarification Act, Pub. L. No. 99-570, Title XI, 100 Stat. 3207-167 (1986) (hereinafter, "Pub. L. 99-570"). This final action implements as final regulations the provisions of that interim rulemaking. In addition, technical amendments are included to correct a typographical error and to correct cross references to certain provisions affected by the interim rule. **DATES:** The provision contained in this action which adopts, as final, interim provisions published March 11, 1987, including the correction of a typographical error to § 278.2, is effective retroactive to April 1, 1987, however, as stated in the March 11, 1987 interim rule, homeless meal providers could submit applications for

authorization to accept food stamps effective March 11, 1987.

All other provisions of this action are effective August 1, 1988.

The provisions of this action cease to be effective after September 30, 1990.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions regarding this rulemaking should be addressed to Russ Gardiner, Acting Chief, Administration and Design Branch, Food Stamp Program, 3101 Park Center Drive, Alexandria, Virginia 22302, or by telephone at (703) 756-3383.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Executive Order 12291

This rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12291 and Secretary's Memorandum No. 1512.1 and has been classified non-major.

The effect of this action on the economy will be less than \$100 million, and it will have an insignificant effect on costs or prices. Competition, employment, investment, productivity, and innovation will remain unaffected. There will be no effect on the competition of United States-based enterprises with foreign-based enterprises.

Executive Order 12372

The Food Stamp Program is listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under No. 10.551. For the reasons set forth in the Final Rule and related Notice to 7 CFR Part 3015, Subpart V (48 FR 29115), this program is excluded from the scope of Executive Order 12372 which requires intergovernmental consultation with State and local officials.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

This final rule has also been reviewed with regard to the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). Anna Kondratas, Administrator of the Food and Nutrition Service, has certified that this final rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. State and local welfare agencies are affected to the extent that they administer the program. Public or private nonprofit meal providers will be affected because of changes which will allow them to accept food stamps in payment for meals served to homeless food stamp recipients. The rule will also affect retail food stores and wholesale food concerns which accept and redeem

food stamps. Thus, while the rule may affect a substantial number of small entities, the effect on any one entity will not be significant.

Paperwork Reduction Act

The reporting and recordkeeping requirements contained in Part 278 of this rule which permit homeless meal providers to accept food stamps and to redeem such stamps through wholesale food concerns have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the Paperwork Reduction Act. The OMB approval numbers for these requirements are 0584-0008 (278.1(b) and (h), 278.3(a)), and 0584-0085 (278.4(c)).

Background

On March 11, 1987, the Department published an interim rulemaking at 52 FR 7554, which implemented the food stamp-related amendments of the Homeless Eligibility Clarification Act, Pub. L. 99-570. That law provides that homeless food stamp recipients (including newly eligible residents of temporary shelters for the homeless) may use their food stamps to purchase prepared meals served by an authorized public or private nonprofit establishment, approved by an appropriate State or local agency, that feeds homeless persons. This rule puts those provisions into final regulatory form.

The Department received a total of 30 comment letters on the interim rulemaking. All comments received were reviewed and given full consideration for inclusion in this final rulemaking. The major concerns raised by the commenters are discussed below. Comments which are not relevant to the final rulemaking or which address issues not related to the rulemaking process are not discussed.

Technical Amendments

Technical amendments are being made to 7 CFR 273, 274 and 278 of the current rules. In the interim rule, several regulatory paragraphs were redesignated. At that time, the Department inadvertently failed to redesignate several cross references to these paragraphs in other parts of the rule. To correct this error, amendments are made to the following sections:

7 CFR 273.1(b)(2)(ii)
7 CFR 273.7(b)(1)(vii)

CFR 273.8(c)(3)
CFR 273.9(b)(4)
CFR 273.9(b)(5)(i)
CFR 273.11(i)
CFR 274.2(h)(1)
CFR 274.3(c)(1)

In addition, the Department is making technical amendment to correct an error in spelling in 7 CFR 278.2(b).

Implementation—Sections 271.2 and 272.9

Four comments were received addressing the implementation of the interim rule. The commenters felt that the implementation date of April 1, 1987, was too soon and/or unrealistic. However, the implementation date was mandated by Pub. L. 99-570. Therefore, the Department had no discretion to change that date. In addition, the implementation dates for this rulemaking have passed and the issue is no longer relevant to this final rule.

Definitions—Section 271.2

Five comments addressed the definition of a homeless food stamp household. The commenters felt the terms "fixed mailing address" and "permanent dwelling" should be clarified and/or expanded to include individuals or families in hotels without heating and cold storage facilities. With enactment of Pub. L. 100-77 on July 22, 1987, this definition is no longer necessary. Title VIII, Section 801, of Pub. L. 100-77 amends section 3 of the Food Stamp Act to establish a statutory definition of "homeless individual". The rule defines a homeless individual as an individual who lacks a fixed and regular nighttime residence or an individual whose primary nighttime residence is: 1) A homeless shelter or refuge; 2) A halfway house or similar institution that provides temporary residence for individuals; 3) A temporary accommodation in the residence of another individual; or 4) In a place not designed for, or ordinarily used as, a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings (a bus, a train, a bus station, a lobby or other public places). The definition of homeless individual is consistent with Congressional intent surrounding the Homeless Eligibility Certification Act enacted in 1986.

Therefore, in an interim rule published September 29, 1987 at 52 FR 36390, the Department amended 7 CFR 271.2 to revise the definition of homeless food stamp household and add the statutory definition of homeless individual. One commenter proposed that the Department change the definition of homeless meal provider to limit the

authorization of homeless meal providers to continuously operating shelters, thus excluding soup kitchens which are typically less established and easily started and stopped. The Department believes that Congress intended to include soup kitchens as homeless meal providers. The pertinent statutory language refers to "public or private nonprofit establishment(s)" (Pub. L. 99-570, s. 11002(a)) (emphasis added.). The Department believes that it would be difficult to interpret the term "establishment" in a manner that would exclude soup kitchens. The Department's conclusion in this matter is supported by the legislative history. *E.g.* 132, Congressional Record s15347 (daily ed. October 7, 1986) (statements of Senator Helms and Senator Domenici). Like all establishments seeking authorization, soup kitchens would still have to meet applicable eligibility criteria. The interim provisions defining a homeless meal provider are adopted as final without change.

State/local Agency Approval of Homeless Meal Providers—Section 272.9

Fourteen commenters addressed the provision requiring State and/or local agencies to approve homeless meal providers prior to their authorization to accept food stamps. A majority of the comments opposed or questioned the need for such agencies' involvement in the approval process for various reasons, including an anticipated increase in burden on the agencies. Several commenters requested that the Department be more specific about standards to be used. Two commenters suggested that State approval requirements be strengthened to include compliance with fire, health, safety, zoning and other similar codes, and two proposed that State agencies be required to monitor the operations of homeless meal providers in addition to approving them. Three commenters felt that the Department should assume responsibility for approving homeless meal providers as part of its retailer authorization process. One commenter asked for clarification of the circumstances under which a State agency can rescind approval of a meal provider.

The requirement that establishments be approved by State or local agencies is mandated by Pub. L. 99-570. The Department has no discretion to change that requirement. We note that the interim rulemaking was designed to provide maximum flexibility to State agencies with regard to designating which State or local government agency

would be responsible for the approval process. As stated in the preamble to the March 11, 1987 interim rulemaking, the Department's policy is not meant to impose any significant burden on the establishment or shelter, or on the responsible State or local agency. The purpose of approval is to ensure that the establishment is in fact serving meals to the homeless.

As stated in the rule, the appropriate State or local agency "shall approve establishments and shelters serving the homeless upon sufficient evidence, as determined by the agency, that the establishment or shelter does in fact serve meals to homeless persons." 52 FR 7554, 7557 (codified at 7 CFR 272.9). The Department does not believe it would be in the best interest of homeless food stamp recipients nor of State or local agencies to impose additional approval criteria. Because the approval process is not meant to pose an undue burden on either the State or local governments or the homeless meal providers, the Department does not believe that it would be appropriate to require systematic, ongoing monitoring of homeless meal providers by the approving authority. However, the responsible agency should be alert to any information or evidence that the provider is no longer serving homeless persons. If this is found to be the case, approval must be rescinded.

For these reasons, the provisions of the interim rule requiring State or local agency approval of homeless meal providers are adopted as final with no changes.

Certification of Residents of Homeless Shelters—Section 273.1(e)(5)

Five commenters addressed the provisions related to the certification of the newly eligible residents of shelters for the homeless. One commenter applauded the provision which expands the Food Stamp Program to another category of homeless persons. The remaining four commenters questioned the provision as follows.

Some commenters requested certification policy clarifications. One asked whether the nonprofit status of a homeless shelter must be verified prior to certification of one of its residents, if the shelter is not authorized as a homeless meal provider. The interim rule did not change program requirements with regard to verification. State agencies should continue to apply their normal verification requirements, including optional verification consistent with food stamp regulations. (See, 7, CFR 273.2(f)) Another commenter requested that the

agency requested clarification of who must verify that a homeless meal provider is nonprofit. Each applicant must provide documentation of nonprofit status to the field office at the time the meal provider application is processed. The Department believes that the interim rule provisions as they pertain to general eligibility criteria for homeless meal providers, and as clarified above, are adequate and serve the best interest of both meal providers and other interested parties. Therefore, they are accepted as final without change.

Meal Pricing Requirements—Section 2(b)

The interim rule established general meal pricing parameters for use by authorized meal providers. The rule provided that homeless recipients, using food stamps to purchase prepared meals, may not be requested to pay more for a meal than the average cost of purchased food used in the preparation of the meal. In addition, the rule stated that payment in food stamps must be voluntary; that if others have the option of eating free or making a cash payment, then food stamp recipients must be afforded the same option (equal treatment); that neither cash nor credit may be used to provide change to recipients using food stamps to pay for meals; and that voluntary overpayments by recipients may be accepted by meal providers.

The Department received a number of comments on the overall issue of meal pricing. The comments addressed meal pricing in general and other provisions such as equal treatment and voluntary use of food stamps they related to meal pricing and equal treatment by meal providers. Several commenters believe that the administrative burden resulting from the implementation of these provisions is too great or is prohibitive. Other commenters objected to or requested clarification of the voluntary use of food stamps provisions. Three commenters want the Department to require meal providers to require the use of food stamps by food stamp recipients to purchase meals. Two others requested that the Department permit providers to charge for related costs, such as costs for storage and preparation, when determining the average cost of a meal. One commenter suggested that meal providers be permitted to round the average cost to the nearest dollar. Five commenters expressed concern that the rule's equal treatment provisions were not strong enough and would allow abuse by meal providers. One commenter requested that the rule be clarified to state that

"pressure to donate" by meal providers is grounds for disqualification. One commenter felt that the meal pricing guidelines contradict the cash change provisions and another recommended that the Department require meal providers to display a sign advising clients of applicable rules, their rights, and the appropriate State agency contact for complaints, questions, etc.

The Department is very sensitive to the fact that the informal and often mostly volunteer nature of many homeless meal provider operations precludes the development and implementation of complex, structured operating and recordkeeping systems. For this reason, the requirements set forth in the interim rule were developed with a view to both minimizing the administrative burden on such meal providers and protecting the rights of recipients, while at the same time complying with the provisions and intent of the law. The language of Pub. L. 99-570 is very specific in the area of meal pricing and related provisions such as voluntary use, and little Departmental discretion was possible or practical. For instance, in the area of meal pricing, the law is specific that the amount requested cannot exceed the average cost of the food in a meal served. Nothing in the law or regulations prohibits a meal provider from requesting less than the average cost of food in a meal. Thus, while rounding down to the nearest whole dollar amount is acceptable, rounding up would not be permitted. This does generate problems when the average cost is not a whole dollar amount, and cash change is prohibited. To address this, the Department decided to allow homeless meal providers to accept voluntary overpayments by recipients. The Department believes that the voluntary overpayment provision is in the best interest of the homeless individuals and participating meal providers.

The interim rule provision which provides for equal treatment of homeless recipients is very clear. Homeless recipients may not be treated differently than other persons in similar circumstances. In response to one comment, the Department wishes to clarify that the equal treatment provisions do not preclude a meal provider, which currently offers meals to homeless persons at no charge, from requesting payment in food stamps after the provider is authorized to accept food stamps. However, meal providers may not refuse to provide a free meal simply because they are aware that an individual receives food stamps. If

others in similar circumstances have the option to eat free or make payment in some way, then homeless food stamp recipients must be given the same option. These provisions are clearly enforceable under the regulations which subject retailers, including meal providers, to penalties and disqualification for failure to comply with program rules and requirements.

In the area of voluntary use of coupons, Pub. L. 99-570 is specific and mandates that the use of food stamps by homeless recipients must be voluntary. Homeless food stamp recipients can in no way be required to use their coupons to pay for meals. Pressuring homeless recipients to use coupons against their will would constitute a violation of the voluntary use provisions of both the statute and regulations and could result in the disqualification of a meal provider.

The Department does not believe that the development and display of a comprehensive recipient information and rights sign would be administratively cost effective or practical. The development, clearance, production, and distribution process for such signs, at either the State or Federal level would preclude effective implementation within a reasonable period of time. This would result in increased administrative and financial burden on State and Federal agencies, with a relatively small level of benefit, if any, for anyone. The Department does not object to the display of such signs at the discretion of State agencies or meal providers which wish to provide such signs. However, the Department is not requiring that such signs be posted.

For the reasons discussed above, the interim rule provisions on meal pricing, equal treatment and voluntary use of coupons are accepted as final without change.

Meal Providers as Authorized Representatives—Section 273.1(f)(4)(iv)

Seven commenters addressed the interim rule provision prohibiting meal providers from serving as authorized representatives for homeless food stamp households. One welfare advocate supports the Department's position on this issue, while the other six commenters disagree with the Department and want the rules changed to permit meal providers to serve as authorized representatives. It remains the Department's position that permitting homeless meal providers to serve as authorized representatives would not be in the best interest of homeless recipients of the Food Stamp Program, overall, for the reasons set

forth in the preamble to the interim final rule. Accordingly, the interim provisions on authorized representatives are adopted as final, unchanged.

Limiting the Participation of Homeless Meal Providers—Section 278.1(h)

One State agency questioned the circumstances and criteria under which FNS will determine if program integrity will be damaged by the participation of a homeless meal provider. The commenter feels that such determinations could conflict with State agency approvals of providers, especially if the provider is the only one of its kind in the area. FNS will make such determinations in much the same manner as it does when assessing the authorization of other establishments. That is, FNS will consider whether the meal provider is in compliance with applicable Program regulations. The Department sees no way in which such a determination could impact negatively on a State agency's approval process since the State process is wholly independent of the Federal determination to limit participation of a specific provider. The State's approval process is unlikely to address the question of whether a provider is the only one of its kind in an area for food stamp purposes.

Compliance of Homeless Meal Providers

Two commenters requested that the Department clarify who is responsible for monitoring meal provider compliance, and how complaints of noncompliance will be handled. Meal provider compliance, as with other retailers, will be the responsibility of FNS field offices. Complaints will be processed consistent with current procedures for handling retailer complaints.

Cash Change—Section 274.10

Seven commenters objected to or questioned the interim rule provision which prohibits the return of cash change to recipients using food stamps to purchase prepared meals. The commenters wanted the Department to permit the return of cash change or otherwise amend the provision to eliminate problems which could arise when the price of a meal served is not an exact dollar amount. It remains the Department's position that the use of cash change or credit slip systems for purposes of providing change is both not consistent with Congressional intent in establishing the prepared meals provisions of Pub. L. 99-570, and not in the best interest of the Food Stamp Program in general or its homeless

recipients. Accordingly, the interim provision on cash change and credit slip systems are adopted as final without change.

As stated in the preamble to the interim rule, the prohibition on cash change is supported by the legislative history, 132 Congressional Record, *Supra*. It is further supported by the practical consideration, also discussed in the interim rule preamble, that because homeless meal providers may not redeem food stamps for cash, they are less likely than other retailers to have the cash necessary to make change. Moreover, allowing cash change in a homeless meal provider setting would invite program abuse. In many instances, homeless meal provider patrons may pay or donate any amount they wish for a meal. If cash change were permitted, a recipient could elect to pay a token amount of food stamps for a meal, receive a relatively large amount of change and in this manner convert food stamps into cash. For example, a patron could inform the provider that he intended to pay 5 cents for a one dollar meal. The provider would have to return 95 cents in change to the patron. This transaction, repeated a number of times, would result in the conversion of most of the patron's food stamp allotment into cash that would be available for expenditures on items other than food. This result would obviously be contrary to the purpose of the Food Stamp Program, as expressed in the Food Stamp Act.

Limiting Participation to Homeless Food Stamp Households (Section 278.2(1))

Ten commenters disagree with the requirement that homeless meal providers ensure that only homeless persons use food stamps to purchase prepared meals. The lack of a specially-marked ID, increased administrative burden, complexity, and lack of guidelines were among the reasons cited for the negative comments. Several commenters requested that the Department suggest or specify the methodology to be used by meal providers for identifying and limiting participation to homeless recipients. The Department is sympathetic with the concerns expressed by the commenters. However, Congressional intent is clear—the provisions apply only to "homeless" food stamp recipients. The Department believes it is impractical to expect that this provision can be enforced at other than the meal provider level. The Department believes that the issuance and use of specially-market identification cards for purchasing prepared meals would place an additional administrative and financial

burden on State agencies and is not necessary for effective operations. All homeless recipients are provided a regular food stamp identification card when certified. Meal providers may request that they be displayed if questions arise. Other, non-homeless recipients will have such cards, but it is unlikely they would go to soup kitchens and shelters for meals. In general, when a patron's status is in question, an oral statement from the patron that he/she is homeless and no knowledge by the meal provider to the contrary, will serve as adequate verification of that person's right to use food stamps to purchase prepared meals. The interim rule provision requiring meal providers to establish a person's right to use food stamps for meals is accepted as final without change.

Reporting

One commenter suggested that the Department require authorized meal providers to submit monthly reports identifying the quantity of coupons received from homeless persons and the name and address of establishments where coupons are redeemed. The Department does not believe such a reporting requirement is necessary nor that it would be in the best interest of meal providers of the Food Stamp Program in general. The burden such a requirement would impose on meal providers and the Federal Government cannot be justified at this time. Consequently, the suggestion is rejected.

Redemption Process—Section 278.2(c)

Three comments were received objecting to the provision which prohibits redemption by meal providers through financial institutions. The commenters cite administrative burden and restrictiveness as reasons for their objections. Pub. L. 99-570 specifically prohibits homeless meal providers from redeeming coupons through the financial institution system. Therefore, the Department has no discretion to permit the use of financial institutions for redemption in this instance. Consequently, the interim rule provision prohibiting redemption through financial institutions is adopted as final without change.

Evaluation

One homeless advocate requested that the Department allow the public to comment on any problems or successes encountered by homeless meal providers before the report to Congress required by Pub. L. 99-570 on the effects of the proposed meals provisions of the statute. The commenter feels it is

tant to demonstrate the number of
ers participating compared to the
er of providers eligible and the
s for non-participation. The
ment's evaluation will address
areas in its report. Comments from
blic are encouraged; such
ents, as well as all other pertinent
ble information, will be carefully
ered as the report to Congress is
ed.

ch
e comments were received
ing to the lack of Food Stamp
um outreach in general, and
ularly as it affects the
ation of homeless persons. On
ber 29, 1987, The Department
hed interim rules at 52 FR 36390
provide for Federal funding, in
ance with section 277, of program
ation to the homeless, which
agencies may undertake at their

Subjects

Part 271

ministrative practice and
ure. Food and Nutrition Service.
tamps. Grant programs—social
ns.

Part 272

ka. Civil rights. Food stamps.
programs—social programs.
ng and recordkeeping
ments.

Part 273

ministrative practice and
re. Aliens. Claims. Food stamps.
Grant programs—social
ns. Penalties. Reporting and
eeping requirements. Social
s. Students.

Part 274

ministrative practice and
re. Food and Nutrition Service.
tamps. Grant programs—social
ns.

Part 278

ministrative practice and
re. Food and Nutrition Service.
tamps. Grant programs—social
ns.
rdingly, 7 CFR Part 271, 272, 273,
278 are amended as follows:
e authority citation for Parts 271,
274 and 278 continues to read
ws:

city: 7 U.S.C. 2011-2029.

e interim rule amending 7 CFR
7, 272, 273, 274 and 278 which
lished at 52 FR 7554-7558 on
11, 1987, with the exception of the

definition of "homeless food stamp
household" in 271.2. (the definition of
"homeless food stamp household" was
removed in the rulemaking at 52 FR
36390 (September 29, 1987)), is adopted
as a final rule with the following change.
In § 278.2 of the interim rule, paragraph
(b) is amended by removing the word
"opinion" in the eighth sentence and
adding in its place the word "option".

PART 272—REQUIREMENTS FOR PARTICIPATING STATE AGENCIES

2. In § 272.1, a new paragraph (g)(99)
is added in numerical order to read as
follows:

§ 272.1 General terms and conditions.

(g) Implementation

(99) *Amendment No. 304.* The
provisions of Amendment No. 304 which
make technical amendments are
effective August 1, 1988.

PART 273—CERTIFICATION OF ELIGIBLE HOUSEHOLDS

§ 273.1 [Amended]

4. In § 273.1(b)(2)(ii), the reference to
"§ 273.11(h)" should read "§ 273.11(i)".

§ 273.7 [Amended]

5. In § 273.7(b)(1)(vii), the reference to
"§ 274.10(e)" should read "§ 274.10(f)".

§ 273.8 [Amended]

6. In § 273.8(c)(3), the reference to
"§ 273.11(h)(1)" and the two references
to "§ 273.11(h)" should read
"§ 273.11(i)(1)" and "§ 273.11(i)",
respectively.

§ 273.9 [Amended]

7. In § 273.9(b)(4), the reference to
"§ 273.11(h)(1)" and the two references
to "§ 273.11(h)" should read
"§ 273.11(i)(1)" and "§ 273.11(i)",
respectively.

8. In § 273.9(b)(5)(i), the reference to
"§ 273.11(j)" should read "§ 273.11(k)".

§ 273.11 [Amended]

9. In § 273.11, the sixteen references to
paragraph "(h)" of that section should
read "(i)" in paragraphs: (i)(2)(ii); (2)(iii);
(2)(v); (2)(vi); (2)(vii); (4); (5)(i)(B); (5)(ii);
(6); and (7).

PART 274—ISSUANCE AND USE OF FOOD COUPONS

§ 274.2 [Amended]

10. In § 274.2(b)(1) the reference to
"§ 273.11(i)(2)" should read
"§ 273.11(j)(2)".

§ 274.3 [Amended]

11. In § 274.3(c)(1) introductory text
the reference to "§ 273.11(i)(1)" should
read "§ 273.11(j)(1)".

PART 278—PARTICIPATION OF RETAIL FOOD STORES, WHOLESALE FOOD CONCERNS AND INSURED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

12. Section 278.9 is amended by
adding a new paragraph (g) as follows:

§ 278.9 Implementation of amendments
relating to participation of retail food
stores, wholesale food concerns and
insured financial institutions.

(g) *Amendment No. 304.* The technical
amendment for Part 278 of *Amendment
No. 304* is effective August 1, 1988.

Anna Kondratas,
Administrator.

Date: June 18, 1988.

[FR Doc. 88-14126 Filed 6-28-88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-30-M

Agricultural Marketing Service

7 CFR Part 929

[AMS-FV-88-042FR]

Cranberries Grown in the State of
Massachusetts et al.

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule increases the
base quantity reserve for the 1988-89
crop year from the required minimum of
2.0 percent to 4.57 percent of the total
base quantities currently issued to
cranberry growers, in order to update
and expand base quantities for the
benefit of growers. This will help to
facilitate the appropriate and equitable
operation of the cranberry marketing
order.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 1, 1988.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Patricia A. Petrella, Marketing
Specialist, Marketing Order
Administration Branch, F&V, AMS,
USDA, Room 2525-S, P.O. Box 96456,
Washington, DC 20090-6456; telephone:
(202) 447-5120.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This
final rule is effective under Marketing
Order No. 929 [7 CFR Part 929], as
amended, regulating the handling of
cranberries grown in 10 States. This
order is effective under the Agricultural
Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as
amended [7 U.S.C. 601-674], hereinafter
referred to as the "ACL".

SECTION B: SAMPLING AND WEIGHTING METHODS AND ESTIMATION ISSUES

Overall Design.....	B-1
Sampling.....	B-1
Sample Design.....	B-1
City Sample.....	B-2
Service Provider Sample.....	B-5
Sample of Homeless Individuals.....	B-8
Data Collection.....	B-12
Data on Provider Operations.....	B-12
Individual Characteristics and Eating Patterns.....	B-12
Weighting.....	B-13
First Stage Weighting.....	B-14
Conditional Second-stage Weighting.....	B-16
Second Stage Non-response Adjustment.....	B-17
Weighting for the Sample of Homeless Respondents.....	B-18
Third-stage Weight Component.....	B-18
Third Stage Non-response Adjustment.....	B-19
Frequency of Use Adjustment.....	B-20
Realignment of Weights for Homeless Who Use Both Soup Kitchens and Shelters.....	B-21
Population Estimate and Confidence Interval.....	B-22
Possible Sources and Extent of Bias in the Estimated Total.....	B-22
Imputation of Weights for Analysis of Characteristics of Homeless Respondents.....	B-24
Other Sampling Issues -- Duplicate Interviews.....	B-25
Estimating Variances for Strata with Only One Sampled City.....	B-25
The Population Estimate: Issues and Limitations.....	B-26
Adjustments We Did Make, and their Effects.....	B-26
Adjustments We Did Not Make, and their Effects.....	B-27

This section on sampling and weighting methods reflects the work of many different individuals. Genevieve Kenney wrote this section and oversaw all sampling steps (except at the third stage) and the development of the sample weights. Barbara Cohen did all of the computer work. Brenda Cox of RTI developed the procedures for the third stage selection of homeless persons at facilities and the notation and formulas for calculating the weights through the third stage (pages B14-B18). Edward Bryant of WESTAT developed the formula used to adjust for differential frequency of use and the method for imputing the weights of those interviewed at soup kitchens in Reno (Pages B19-B20, B-22). Martin Frankel of NORC brought to our attention the possible biases associated with using the estimated skip interval as the third stage weight in place of the actual skip interval and with ignoring multiple use of soup kitchens by respondents within a given day.

SECTION B: SAMPLING AND WEIGHTING METHODS AND ESTIMATION ISSUES

Overall Design

The key elements of the design for this study are:

1. Data bases created through probability sampling techniques to produce nationally representative, statistically valid samples of providers (target sample size of 400) and the service-using homeless (target sample size of 1800).
2. Data collected from a small sample (target sample size of 300) of non-service using homeless individuals which, while not capable of supporting statistical generalizations, could provide some suggestive points of comparison to the service-using homeless on key variables.
3. Data collection limited to providers and homeless individuals in cities with populations of 100,000 or more.
4. In-person interviews with both providers and the homeless; detailed observations, enabling nutritional analysis, of meals actually served by providers, and information on eating patterns obtained from homeless individuals. Interview content geared to issues involved in implementation and functioning of the prepared meals provision, and to filling gaps in existing knowledge pertinent to providers of food services and nutrition of the homeless.
5. Data collection was initially planned at two points in time, prior to implementation of the prepared meals provision to capture the "pre" situation, and after the provision had operated for one year, to capture the "post" situation and compare it to "pre" to assess impact. However, there were too few providers authorized under the provision to warrant conducting the "post" data collection to parallel the "pre" data collection. Interviews with the 40 providers who were authorized within the first year of the implementation of the provision have been conducted, and are reported in Volume I.

Sampling

Sample Design

The universe of this study consists of the homeless population who use the services of soup kitchens and shelters in U.S. cities with populations of 100,000 and more, and the soup kitchens and shelters in those cities that serve the homeless. Empirically based estimates of the total number of homeless nationwide range from 250,000 to 750,000. While cities with 100,000 persons or more contained 25 percent of the United States population in 1984, the HUD study estimated in the same year that 75 percent of the homeless lived in metropolitan areas, a somewhat broader geographic area than the cities in our sample ("A Report to the Secretary on the Homeless and Emergency Shelters," U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research, 1984).

Survey interviews were planned for 400 service provider sites in 20 cities during the month of March 1987. In fact, 381 providers were interviewed. The target sample size for homeless individuals was 1800, to be interviewed at the 400 sites. The actual number of service-using homeless interviewed was 1704. The target sample size for non-service using homeless was 300 and a total of 142 were interviewed. The samples of cities, service providers, and the homeless (excluding those interviewed at congregating sites) were selected randomly so as to be nationally representative. The sample was designed to produce estimates of characteristics of the service-using homeless population with a precision of ± 3 percent at a 95 percent confidence level and estimates of service provider characteristics with a precision of ± 7 percent at a 95 percent confidence level.

There are no national lists of service providers or of the homeless from

which to sample. Therefore, a multistage probability sample was constructed. Cities were selected first, service providers within sampled cities were selected second, and homeless persons at those sites were then sampled. While the focus is on the service-using homeless population, 300 interviews were also planned with homeless persons who had not used either a shelter or a soup kitchen for the preceding seven days. These persons were located at congregating sites (e.g., in public parks or transportation depots). Interviews with non-service users were considered desirable to determine whether their diet quality, eating behavior, and access to food stamps differ substantially from homeless persons who use services. In fact, 999 individuals were screened at congregating sites, of whom 142, or 14 percent, were determined to be both homeless and non-service users.

City Sample

The multistage probability sample began with the selection of cities. According to the latest (1984) population data available, 178 cities have populations numbering more than 100,000 (each borough of New York City is counted as a separate entity). Cities were used as Primary Sampling Units for several reasons. Cities were chosen instead of counties because they more accurately reflect a coherent, integrated service provider community. This was important because we wanted to be able to assess changes caused by the prepared meals provision on specific provider communities. We also expected that administrative policies for implementing food stamp regulations concerning the homeless would vary from State to State and, within a State, would vary from city to city--both from the point of view of the homeless individual seeking food stamps and from the point of view of the service provider seeking to become authorized to accept food stamps.

The number of cities to sample was determined on the basis of obtaining a sample size that would yield reasonable estimates, coupled with time limitations and cost constraints. Thus we began the work of designing the sample with 20 cities as our target city sample size.

The sample design had two components. First, all cities with population sizes exceeding 1,000,000 were sampled with certainty. This involved a total of six cities: New York, Los Angeles, Houston, Chicago, Detroit, and Philadelphia. Within New York City, we then selected two boroughs at random from among the four boroughs with populations exceeding 1 million (Queens, the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Manhattan). This was done in an effort to get closer to the idea

of provider communities that we would have in other cities. It was felt that selecting providers at random from the entire City of New York would result in too diffuse a set of providers, with no associations with each other, and not able to present a picture of the degree of inter-provider activity we anticipated finding in cities with more geographical concentration among providers. The two boroughs selected were Manhattan and Queens. By including these six largest cities with certainty, the city-level sampling variance for a large part of the homeless population is eliminated, thereby increasing sampling precision. The sampling frame for selecting the remaining 14 cities was stratified to ensure adequate representation of all city sizes and to reflect potential differences in food stamp office practices across States and regions.

In selecting the 14 other cities, all the remaining cities with populations under 1,000,000 were stratified into 11 categories. Strata were formed on the basis of two criteria:

1. Population size;
2. Geographic region.

The cities were stratified into three strata on the basis of size because the nature and composition of the homeless population and of the service community were expected to vary with the size of the city. Four geographic subdivisions were used to ensure a representative sample and because policies toward the homeless might vary systematically by region. This four by three stratification yielded 12 strata. However, the stratum with eastern cities of size 250,000 to 500,000 was combined with the stratum that contained eastern cities of size 500,000 to 1,000,000 yielding 11 strata in total. This was done because there was only one city in the East with a population between 500,000 and 1,000,000. The resulting strata were:

- Stratum 1 -- Southern cities with populations between 100,000 and 250,000. This stratum contains 41 cities.
- Stratum 2 -- Western cities with populations between 100,000 and 250,000. This stratum contains 33 cities.
- Stratum 3 -- Midwestern cities with populations between 100,000 and 250,000. This stratum contains 26 cities.
- Stratum 4 -- Eastern cities with populations between 100,000 and 250,000. This stratum contains 16 cities.
- Stratum 5 -- Southern cities with populations between 250,000 to 500,000. This stratum contains 15 cities.
- Stratum 6 -- Western cities with populations between 250,000 to 500,000. This stratum contains 9 cities.
- Stratum 7 -- Midwestern cities with populations between 250,000 to 500,000. This stratum contains 7 cities.
- Stratum 8 -- Southern cities with populations between 500,000 to 1,000,000. This stratum contains 7 cities.
- Stratum 9 -- Western cities with populations between 500,000 to 1,000,000. This stratum contains 5 cities.

Table B-1. Sample Cities for the FNS Prepared Meals Study

Stratum Number	Population in Thousands	Region	Total Cities	Sample Selections
1	100-250	South	41	Waco, TX Winston Salem, NC
2	100-250	West	33	Reno, NV
3	100-250	North Central	26	Madison, WI
4	100-250	Northeast	16	Bridgeport, CT
5	250-500	South	15	Atlanta, GA Birmingham, AL
6	250-500	West	9	Seattle, WA
7	250-500	North Central	7	St. Louis, MO
8	500-1,000	South	7	New Orleans, LA Memphis, TN
9	500-1,000	West	5	San Jose, CA
10	500-1,000	North Central	4	Cleveland, OH
11	250-1,000	Northeast	5	Pittsburgh, PA
12	7,896	Northeast	1	New York City, NY*
13	2,812	West	1	Los Angeles, CA
14	1,234	South	1	Houston, TX
15	3,369	North Central	1	Chicago, IL
16	1,514	North Central	1	Detroit, MI
17	1,949	Northeast	1	Philadelphia, PA

Two of the four boroughs with population over one million were selected at random, yielding Manhattan and Queens to represent New York City.

Stratum 10-- Midwestern cities with populations between 500,000 to 1,000,000.
This stratum contains 4 cities.

Stratum 11-- Eastern cities with populations between 250,000 to 1,000,000.
This stratum contains 5 cities.

Once the strata were defined, it was necessary to decide how many cities to draw from each stratum to comprise the total sample size of 20 cities (14 to be selected from the 11 strata and the 6 certainty cities). Ideally, the allocation would be proportional to the total homeless or to the total service-using homeless population. Further, within a stratum, the ideal selection probability for each city would be derived from the size of the homeless population or the size of the service-using homeless population in the city. Because there were no agreed-upon estimates of these variables, the numbers in poverty were used instead to do the sample allocation. This procedure is valid so long as there is a constant relationship between the number of homeless persons and the number in poverty across cities. Future studies will want to use a better measure of size because we found that the estimated number of homeless using services was not closely correlated with the number in poverty.

Thus, the number of persons in poverty in each stratum was calculated (A), along with the total number of persons in poverty in the universe of cities with populations between 100,000 and 1,000,000 in 1984 (U). The number of cities to choose for the sample from each stratum was determined by dividing the number of persons in poverty in a given stratum (A) by the total number in poverty over the 11 strata (U) (excluding the certainty city strata), multiplied by 14 (the number of cities to be drawn from the 11 strata). Thus the number of cities drawn from each stratum equaled $A/U \times 14$ (the stratum weight), rounded to the nearest integer. Results are presented in Table B-1.

Service Provider Sample

The next stage in the design was to sample service providers within each sampled city. A total of approximately 400 service providers were targeted. Given cost and efficiency considerations, it was determined that this number would permit meaningful analysis of the service provider communities in different cities.

A full sampling frame was developed for each city consisting of all shelters and soup kitchens serving the homeless in Winter 1987. This involved several iterations of assembling lists of providers for all available sources, calling those providers to verify types of services and numbers of homeless served, and continuing efforts to identify and add to the list any providers who should have been on it but were not. Two iterations were completed prior to field work; the third occurred while interviewers were actually in the field. Inevitably, providers had gone out of business, or had shifted clientele and no longer served the homeless. We also identified additional providers. When this happened, the provider was added to the sample if it would have been chosen with certainty had we known about it prior to field work. If it would not have been chosen with certainty, but would have taken priority over a provider that had not already been interviewed, it was substituted. Otherwise it was not included.

The service provider universe was then stratified to ensure adequate representation of different types of providers, and of different size operations. Ideally, we would have selected about 20 service providers in each of the 20 sample cities. However, the number of service providers varied greatly depending on the size of the city. There were fewer than 20 service providers in the smaller cities and there more than 20 in the largest cities. Adjustments were made accordingly to yield a total target sample of 400 providers. The service providers were stratified into three categories:

1. Shelters for the homeless that serve meals;
2. Shelters for the homeless that do not serve meals;
3. Soup kitchens serving the homeless.

This stratification served the purpose of providing adequate representation of the different types of service providers, who might have different responses to the prepared meals provision. Within a city, the service providers were stratified on the basis of the size and type of their operation, and selection of sites proceeded with probabilities proportionate to size. The size of the service provider for soup kitchens was gauged by the number of meals served at their largest meal and the number of days on which they served meals per week, or for shelters by the average number of persons staying in the shelter per day.

Table B-2 presents information about the provider sampling procedures and their results. For each city in our sample, Table B-2's first column gives the ideal sample size for the city (Manhattan and Queens are treated as separate cities for the provider sample selection). The ideal sample size was determined by distributing the 400 target sample facilities across the 11 strata and certainty cities in proportion to the size of their poverty populations. This is in accord with a sample design that produces a self-weighting sample.

The next three columns of Table B-2 show our initial and final estimates of the size of the provider universe in each city, and whether those universes were larger or smaller than our ideal sample size. Initial estimates came from lists and telephone calls to each city. Each potential provider was then contacted to determine that they indeed served the homeless, served at least 10 adults if a shelter and 15 adults if a soup kitchen, to learn the actual average number of persons they served at a meal or on a given night, and to learn if they were within the city limits. Providers were also asked about other providers, to help us fill in any blanks on our lists. Final estimates reflect additional information that we obtained when we were actually in the cities for interviewing, and could observe the different shelter and soup kitchen operations. The fifth column gives the final target sample size for each city, which incorporates reallocations of providers to the larger cities, to compensate for the shortfall of providers in some of the smaller cities. Future studies of this type would be well advised to increase their numbers of the smallest cities, to assure that the number of providers available from cities representing these strata is adequate to meet the ideal sample sizes.

The next six columns of Table B-2 show the efforts that were made to fill the target sample size, and their outcomes. The columns labeled A, B and C are critical to an assessment of outcomes. They show, of those providers contacted

TABLE B-2
IDEAL, ATTEMPTED AND ACTUAL PROVIDER SAMPLE, BY CITY
INCLUDING REASONS FOR NON-INCLUSION

CITY	IDEAL SAMPLE SIZE	INITIAL AND FINAL ESTIMATES OF PROVIDER UNIVERSE		+ ¹ -	FINAL TAR- GET SAMPLE SIZE ²	CONTACTED OR ATTEMPT- ED ³	INTER- VIEWED	REFUSED	COULD NOT REACH	DID NOT EXIST	INAPPRO- PRIATE ⁴	COMPLE- TION RATE ⁵
		Initial	Final									
							A	B	C			D
Manhattan	29	92	92	+	44	61	44	17	0	0	0	72%
Los Angeles	21	26	25	+	25	27	20	5	0	1	1	80
Philadelphia	14	170	165	+	22	34	22	8	1	0	3	71
Detroit	10	57	54	+	14	18	14	1	0	2	1	93
Chicago	25	55	47	+	39	51	40	4	3	1	3	85
Houston	9	24	15	+	14	21	14	1	0	2	6	93
Atlanta	19	59	54	+	29	40	29	1	5	2	3	83
Birmingham	19	16	13	-	14	16	13	0	0	1	2	100
Cleveland	16	37	33	+	24	28	24	2	0	0	2	92
Memphis	21	24	15	-	15	24	15	0	0	1	8	100
New Orleans	21	13	12	-	13	13	12	0	0	1	0	100
Pittsburgh	17	20	19	+	19	20	18	1	0	0	1	95
San Jose	18	18	15	-	15	18	12	3	0	0	3	80
Seattle	18	44	36	+	28	40	28	7	1	1	3	78
St. Louis	17	31	29	+	26	33	25	4	0	0	4	86
Bridgeport, CT	17	12	11	-	11	12	11	0	0	1	0	100
Madison, WI	18	11	11	-	11	11	11	0	0	0	0	100
Reno, NV	21	11	10	-	10	11	8	1	0	1	1	89
Waco, TX	20	5	5	-	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	100
Winston-Salem	20	11	7	-	8	12	7	1	0	2	2	88
Queens	29	23	18	-	16	23	9	9	0	4	1	50
Totals	400				400	517	381	62	10	20	44	84%

¹ Universe smaller (-) or larger (+) than ideal sample size.

² Final target sample size differs from ideal sample size because reallocations to obtain more providers from larger cities were necessary when smaller cities could not fill their target numbers.

³ Includes initial sample of 400, plus back-up sample as needed.

⁴ "Inappropriate" includes providers who were too small, were not within the city limits, did not house the homeless or did not directly offer either food or shelter (e.g., Traveler's Aid).

⁵ The completion rate was obtained using the following formula: $D = A / (A + B + C)$. This formula counts refusals and providers who could not be reached as sampling failures, but excludes from the denominator providers discovered to be inappropriate or non-existent.

or for whom contact was attempted, those who were actually interviewed, those who refused, and those who could not be reached. These three categories of providers were considered the true target sample; providers on our list whom we learned in the process of sampling were inappropriate for the sample, who had gone out of business, or who were duplicates (two programs were identical, but were known by different names), were removed from the final estimate of the provider universe. The last column of Table B-2, Column D, gives the completion rates for each city, and over the entire sample. Completion rates were calculated as $D = A / (A + B + C)$, or, the number of completed interviews divided by the sum of completed interviews, refusals, and providers we were unable to reach. The overall completion rate was 84 percent; completion rates in each city ranged from 100 percent to 71 percent excluding Queens, with a 50 percent rate in Queens. These completion rates for the provider sample compare favorably to completion rates of 95 and 85 percent for NORC's two waves of data collection in Chicago in the fall of 1985 and the winter of 1986 (Rossi, et al. 1986). As can be seen from Table B-2, in Chicago itself we achieved a rate of cooperation equivalent to NORC's second wave, and rates in our other cities, excluding Queens, were comparable.

Sample of Homeless Individuals

The service-using homeless population was interviewed at sampled shelters and soup kitchens. However, the subcontractor (Research Triangle Institute--RTI) conducting the individual interviews was not able to do so at all of the same provider locations where the Urban Institute obtained provider interviews. Therefore, we present in Table B-3 the differences between the UI and RTI provider samples, before going on to describe the sample of homeless individuals.

The data in Table B-3 indicate that RTI was able to interview homeless individuals in 89 percent of the provider sites included in the UI provider sample, which is equivalent to 75 percent of the targeted provider sites (compared to UI's provider completion rate of 84 percent). The missing facilities were concentrated in New York City (10 in Manhattan and 3 in Queens), where UI's difficulties in obtaining initial permission from the city's Human Resources Administration, and then from each provider, delayed transmission of site information to RTI and made it difficult for RTI interviewers to meet their schedule deadlines. In addition, five each were missed in Chicago, Atlanta and St. Louis. Other missing providers appear to be relatively evenly distributed over the remaining cities.

Our sample of the service-using homeless population was interviewed at the shelters and soup kitchens successfully contacted by RTI, and constituted 90 percent of our efforts to interview homeless individuals. Because the sampling plan was initially designed to be self-weighting, we planned to sample evenly across all the cities, so that approximately 100 homeless individuals would be interviewed per city. Deviations from 100 interviews per city resulted due to earlier rounding in the allocation, and to the need to reallocate interviews with providers to include more in larger cities. Within a city, the same number of interviews were targeted for each site--a plan that yielded substantially different numbers of interviews per city, and which contributed to variation in the individual sample weights. To compensate for these deviations from equal probabilities of selection, appropriate weights were calculated for each individual record on the basis of sample design and service use.

TABLE B-3
COMPARISON OF URBAN INSTITUTE AND RESEARCH TRIANGLE INSTITUTE PROVIDER SAMPLES
BY CITY, INCLUDING REASONS FOR NON-INCLUSION

CITY	DEMOGRAPHIC- NATOR	URBAN INSTITUTE ²		RESEARCH TRIANGLE INSTITUTE					COMPLETION RATES	
		INTER- VIEWED	COMPLETION RATE	YES ³	REFUSED ⁴	UNABLE TO SCHEDULE ⁵	OTHER ⁶			
		A	B	B/A	C				C/B	C/A
Manhattan	61	44	72%	33	1	10	0	75%	54%	
Los Angeles	25	20	80	18	1	0	1	90	72	
Philadelphia	31	22	71	22	0	0	0	100	71	
Detroit	15	14	93	13	1	0	0	93	87	
Chicago	47	40	85	34	5	0	1	85	72	
Houston	15	14	93	13	1	0	0	93	87	
Atlanta	35	29	83	24	2	1	2	83	69	
Birmingham	13	13	100	12	0	0	1	92	92	
Cleveland	26	24	92	23	1	0	0	96	88	
Memphis	15	15	100	12	0	2	1	80	80	
New Orleans	12	12	100	12	0	0	0	100	100	
Pittsburgh	19	18	95	18	0	0	0	100	95	
San Jose	15	12	80	12	0	0	0	100	80	
Seattle	35	28	78	28	0	0	0	100	78	
St. Louis	29	25	86	20	1	2	2	80	69	
Bridgeport, CT	11	11	100	9	0	1	1	82	82	
Madison, WI	11	11	100	11	0	0	0	100	100	
Reno, NV	9	8	89	9	0	0	0	112	100	
Waco, TX	5	5	100	5	0	0	0	100	100	
Winston-Salem	8	7	88	6	0	0	1	86	75	
Queens	18	9	50	6	0	3	0	67	33	
Totals	453	381	84%	340	13	19	10	89%	75%	

- 1 Number of providers in each city that UI interviewed plus those who refused UI interviews or that UI could not reach.
- 2 Same figures as in Table A-2
- 3 UI interviewed the provider and provider permitted RTI to interview homeless clients.
- 4 UI interviewed the provider, but the provider refused to let RTI interview homeless clients despite having agreed at first UI contact.
- 5 UI interviewed the provider, but RTI was unable to schedule a time with the provider to interview homeless clients.
- 6 UI interviewed the provider, but RTI did not obtain interviews with homeless clients for other reasons (e.g., shelter was closed).

Within each provider site, homeless individuals were randomly sampled according to pre-set instructions. The interviewer was given a target number of screeners to complete. Upon arrival at the site, the interviewer obtained from the provider the number of individuals expected to sleep or eat at the site on that day (or at that meal). The interviewer divided the target number of screeners into the expected number of service users to obtain the skip interval, and then determined the first respondent by picking a random number between 1 and 10. Enumeration proceeded either by using a roster available from the provider, or by enumerating beds or chairs and tables, or by counting people off as they came through a food line. If the results of the screener indicated that the person was homeless, the interviewer arranged to complete the interview and to pay the respondent \$5.00. Completed interviews were obtained from 97 percent of persons identified as homeless. In soup kitchens, only 57 percent of screened individuals were identified as homeless.

These procedures resulted in a sample of 1704 homeless individuals, distributed over cities as indicated in Table B-4. For three cities, we have sample sizes that exceed 150--Manhattan, Chicago, and Atlanta. Four additional cities have sample sizes that exceed 100--Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Seattle, and Saint Louis (Los Angeles has 89). The combined sample size for the small cities is 163; for the medium cities it is 428; for the large cities it is 343; for the certainty cities excluding New York City it is 548; and for the two selected boroughs of New York it is 222.

TABLE B-4

Number of Homeless Respondents Per City
in the Final Sample of 1704

<u>Cities</u>	<u>Sample Size</u>
Manhattan	186
Los Angeles	89
Philadelphia	112
Detroit	67
Chicago	217
Houston	63
Atlanta	155
Birmingham	53
Cleveland	76
Memphis	61
New Orleans	33
Pittsburgh	108
San Jose	65
Seattle	117
Saint Louis	103
Bridgeport	31
Madison	38
Reno	36
Waco	23
Winston-Salem	35
Queens	36
	1704

The remaining 10 percent of our efforts to interview homeless individuals was concentrated on obtaining interviews at congregating sites such as parks and transportation depots, where homeless people may be found who do not use meal and shelter services. The rationale for including this subsample is stated on page B-1, point 2. The selection of congregating sites themselves was not based on a random process, but followed the suggestions of local police and providers. Once at the congregating sites, random procedures were employed that paralleled those used at service provider sites. That is, places to sit or lie down were enumerated, places were selected according to a skip interval with a random start, and any individuals occupying those places were approached and screened, and selected into the sample when it was determined that they were both homeless and had not used either shelter and meal services within the 7 days preceding the interview.

However, we knew we could not gather these data from individuals selected on a true probability basis, because there was no defined universe of non-service using homeless and, without resorting to prohibitively expensive block probability sampling approaches (such as NORC used for their street sample in Chicago), we could not select congregating sites on a probability basis. They therefore could not be treated as if they were on a statistically equal footing with our primary sample.

The congregating sites themselves were selected based on advice from local providers and the local police. Probability selection procedures were applied once the interviewers were actually at the site. Local providers and the local police suggested locations where the homeless could be found. We selected the five sites in each city that were mentioned most frequently as places to find homeless individuals during the day, and 2-3 sites that were mentioned as evening congregating sites (6-9 pm). (As it turned out, no differences were found between individuals interviewed at daytime and evening congregating sites, so the data from all have been combined). Once at a congregating site, individuals were enumerated, skip intervals and random starts were established, and selection and screening of eligibles proceeded as at any provider location.

One final screening criterion was applied to individuals at congregating sites. Not only did they have to be homeless, they had to be non-users of services as defined by not having used a shelter or soup kitchen within the past 7 days. If they had used either, they were screened out. The screening statistics are in themselves of interest. Almost 1,000 persons (999) were screened at congregating sites. Of these, 473, or 47 percent, were found to be homed; 445, or 45 percent, were homeless; and 81 (8%) refused, broke off the contact, or otherwise did not cooperate with the interviewer. Of the homeless persons identified, 153, or 34 percent, had used shelters at least once within the past 7 days. An additional 103, or 23 percent of those who were homeless, had used soup kitchens but not shelters during the previous 7 days. (The screening process did not identify those who used both). Altogether, 256 persons, or 57 percent of those identified as homeless at congregating sites, were screened out as service users. An additional 16 persons provided no information on these questions, due to breakoffs or refusals. This left 173 individuals, or 39 percent of the homeless at congregating sites, who were identified during the screening process as non-service users. During the course of the interview, when asked where they slept or ate for the last 7 days, an additional 31 individuals revealed that they had used either shelters or soup kitchens at least once during the relevant time period, bringing down to 142 the final

sample of non-users--equivalent to 32 percent of the people originally identified as homeless at congregating sites, and 14 percent of all persons screened.

Data Collection

Data on Provider Operations

To understand provider operations as they might pertain to becoming authorized to accept food stamps, in-person interviews were conducted with the directors of sampled meal and shelter programs. The interview covered the nature and scope of the services the provider offered, and the provider's clientele. We also asked about the provider's experience with helping clients get food stamps, the provider's knowledge of food stamp receipt among their clients, and the provider's knowledge of and potential interest in the prepared meals provision. Finally, we obtained detailed information about the provider's meal service operation, including sources of cash income for food, sources of food itself, paid and volunteer labor, budget for meal services, method of meal preparation, and other issues pertinent to the prepared meals provision. In addition, we observed one meal at each provider site that served meals, noting the food items served and the portion sizes in sufficient detail to permit nutritional analysis of the meals served to homeless persons. Forty-five breakfasts, 135 midday meals and 128 dinners were observed, for a total of 308 meals observed.

The prepared meals provision has the potential to benefit providers by helping them expand their services. Providers currently serving meals might be able to increase the amounts or types of foods available to them by using food stamps to buy more, or more nutritious foods than they served prior to the provision. They might also be able to serve more people at meals, or to add

meal types (e.g., to start serving breakfast), or to expand the number of days on which they serve. Providers not serving meals in 1987 because they lacked resources to do so might be able to use food stamps conveyed to them by the homeless to set up a meal service for the first time. The survey collected data revealing providers' interests in these types of expansion, and their perceptions of the ability of the prepared meals provision to help them in these efforts.

Individual Characteristics and Eating Patterns

The individual interview sought information on eating patterns, sources of food, dietary intake during the preceding 24-hour period, and experience with the Food Stamp Program. Questions probing these issues occupied approximately half of the 15-minute interview with homeless individuals. Some were taken from pre-existing national nutrition surveys, and some were constructed expli-

on length of homelessness, a description of the person's last residential situation, income amounts and sources during the past month, demographic characteristics, and other characteristics (such as depression/demoralization, or chemical dependency) that might help explain why a person was more or less able to obtain adequate nutrition while homeless.

Weighting

Weights were constructed for the data collected from providers and for the data collected from the service-using homeless respondents. The development of appropriate weights is made difficult because each homeless respondent can be associated with multiple facilities on the sample frame. The weighting involves several discrete steps which take into account the sample design, patterns of non-response, and the service-use pattern of the respondent.

To recapitulate the sampling design, in the first stage cities with populations of 100,000 or more were first stratified by size and by region and were then chosen with probability proportionate to the size of their poverty populations. In the second stage providers were selected within the sampled cities. Next, a day in March 1987 was selected for interviewing at a particular provider. In the final stage homeless persons were selected from those at the sampled provider on the sampled day.

The probability of a provider being included in the sample depends on the probability of selection at each prior stage in the sampling process. For providers, the final weight depended upon the probability that the city was included in the sample, the probability that the provider was included conditional on the city being included, and on a non-response adjustment by city and by type of provider. Non-response adjustments were constructed separately for soup kitchens, shelters with meals, and shelters without meals within each city.

In addition to these three components of the provider weight, the weight developed for homeless respondents accounted for the probability of a respondent being selected at the sample provider conditional on the provider having been chosen, a non-response adjustment based on the response rates of the homeless in four city size categories for shelters and soup kitchens separately, a correction for differential use of providers among respondents, and adjustment for the overlap in the sample frame.

The weighting reflects the sample design and corrects for the fact that the respondents (providers and the homeless alike) did not have equal chances of selection. The non-response corrections for providers presume that the responses of non-responding providers would be similar to those of responding providers at the same type of provider in the same city. The non-response adjustment for homeless respondents assumes that non-respondents are similar to responding individuals in the same city size and facility type category.

For conceptual purposes when discussing the weights assigned to individuals, the presentation below goes first through the stages of weight construction for those interviewed at soup kitchens and those at interviewed at shelters as if the respondents were in two different samples. We will then correct for the fact that there is considerable overlap in the two samples as many homeless respondents use both shelters and soup kitchens. The last stage of

weight construction will re-align the weights of the homeless who use both soup kitchens and shelters relative to those who use only one or the other. Within the sample of individuals interviewed at shelters, we will have respondents who also use soup kitchens and respondents that report exclusive use of shelters. Within the sample of individuals interviewed at soup kitchens, we will have respondents who also use shelters and respondents who report exclusive use of soup kitchens. To obtain an accurate picture of the service-using homeless population (those who use either soup kitchens or shelters or both) we must correct for the fact that the group that uses both has been included in the sample twice--having had a chance to be interviewed at both shelters and soup kitchens. Therefore, we corrected for the over-representation of this group in our sample by reducing their weights by one half on average.

This weighting scheme leads to consistent estimates of population parameters of interest because it attributes to each observation its true population weight (or a consistent estimate of its true weight). Failing to take into account the sample selection process and the differential probabilities of inclusion in the sample due to the respondent's frequency and pattern of use of providers would lead to biased and inconsistent results. We would be giving too much weight to the homeless respondents who use both soup kitchens and shelters, relative to those who use only one or the other, and too much weight to regular users of services relative to infrequent users if we did not make the adjustments that are incorporated in the weighting scheme.

First Stage Weighting

The first stage of selection involved selecting 14 cities from 11 strata and including 6 cities with certainty. All cities within the coterminous United States with total populations of 100,000 or more in 1984 were eligible for inclusion in the study (Statistical Abstract of the United States 1986, Bureau of the Census, Table 19, pp.16-18). Five cities were selected with certainty--Los Angeles, Houston, Chicago, Detroit and Philadelphia. New York City was handled separately. The 4 boroughs with more than 1 million persons were placed into one stratum from which two boroughs were selected. Staten Island, the fifth borough, with less than 1 million population, was included with other Northeast cities of its size. The remaining cities were stratified based on census region and population size. Regions were south, northeast, midwest and west; city sizes were 100,000 to 250,000, 250,000 to 500,000 and 500,000 to 1,000,000. Each city within a stratum was assigned a probability proportional to the number of people in its population in poverty in 1980 (County and City Data Book, 1983).

Let $C(h+)$ be the total persons in poverty in noncertainty stratum h and $C_n(++)$ be the total count of people in poverty over all noncertainty strata (excluding New York City boroughs). The first-stage sample allocation to stratum h was calculated as:

$$n(h) = 14 C(h+)/C_n(++)$$
(1)

and rounded to the nearest integer.

With this approach, the first-stage probability of selection of city i from stratum h can be expressed as:

$$p_1(hi) = n(h) C(hi)/C(h+)$$
(2)

New York city was handled separately. Two of New York City's four boroughs with populations exceeding 1,000,000 were selected with probability proportional to their number of people in poverty. For the two New York City selections, the probability of selection was:

$$p_1(12i) = 2 C(12i)/C(12+) \quad (3)$$

The cities drawn as a consequence of this selection process were already given, in Table B-1. The first stage weight component for city i from stratum h is given by the inverse of the first stage probability of selection. These weights are given in Table B-5. The cities that were included with certainty had weights equal to one.

The weights are largest for the 5 cities with populations sizes between 100,000 and 250,000. This is due to the fact that while each of these four strata had allocated to it the integer nearest to the optimal number of selections, each contained many more cities than the strata for the larger city sizes, making it less likely that one small city would be selected relative to cities in larger city size categories.

TABLE B-5

City Weights

Stratum	City	Weights
Stratum 1	Waco	21.48
	Winston-Salem	20.58
Stratum 2	Reno	58.59
Stratum 3	Madison	19.22
Stratum 4	Bridgeport	14.29
Stratum 5	Atlanta	3.90
	Birmingham	7.42
Stratum 6	Seattle	8.11
Stratum 7	Saint Louis	4.45
Stratum 8	New Orleans	3.34
	Memphis	3.49
Stratum 9	San Jose	7.76
Stratum 10	Cleveland	3.16
Stratum 11	Pittsburgh	5.80
Stratum 12	Manhattan	2.20
	Queens	3.21
Stratum 13	Los Angeles	1.00
Stratum 14	Detroit	1.00
Stratum 15	Philadelphia	1.00
Stratum 16	Houston	1.00
Stratum 17	Chicago	1.00

This was true for Reno, which had the largest city weight while, additionally, Reno had a small population size relative to the other cities in its stratum so that it had an even smaller probability of selection. Sensitivity tests described later demonstrated that the large weights on the provider data

from Reno had an insignificant impact on the means of the variables calculated for the whole sample and did not exercise any undue influence on the national estimates. However, the weights on homeless respondents interviewed at soup kitchens in Reno were so large that they were adjusted downward. The adjustment that was made and its consequences will be addressed following a full scale discussion of the development of sample weights.

Conditional Second-stage Weight Component

Since the sample design was set up to produce self-weighting estimates of the homeless respondents, the second stage selection probabilities were adjusted, to the extent possible, to correct for the unavoidable unequal probabilities of selection of cities at the first stage. Second stage weights were calculated separately for the provider and the individual sample. These samples differed to the extent that the provider sample contained some responding providers that were refusals and non-responding providers for individual sample and vice-versa.

With a target sample size for providers of 400, 12 cities had fewer than the optimal number of providers, so that each provider in those cities, conditional on the city having been selected into the sample, had a probability equal to one of sample inclusion. In the 9 other cities, the providers were stratified by size and by type of provider into sampling and weighting classes of small, medium, and large soup kitchens, shelters with meals and shelters without meals (in Manhattan further stratification was used to separate out the welfare hotels, the private shelters and the city shelters). Small shelters were ones with 25 or fewer persons per night, medium shelters were ones with between 26 and 100 persons per night while large shelters were ones with 101 or more persons staying per night on average. For soup kitchens, the average number of persons served per day at the largest meal served was used as the measure of size. Average persons served per day was calculated using the number of persons served at the largest meal of a day and the number of days per month that the provider was open. The soup kitchens were then classified into small, medium and large by the average number of persons served per day on the basis of the size breakdown given for shelters.

In the 12 cities where the optimum number of providers for our sample was equal to or greater than the number of providers in the city, all providers were included. Hence their probability of inclusion was 1 and their second stage weight was 1.

For 9 cities sampling of providers was necessary. Within each of these 9 cities, separate sampling/weighting classes of providers were created for small, medium and large soup kitchens, shelters without meals and shelters with meals. Allocation was done with probability proportional to the size of the homeless population being served by the providers in each stratum except in Philadelphia shelters, where selection was done randomly within the small, medium and large strata. Each provider was given a probability of selection within its stratum and city that was equal to its size relative to the total size of all the providers within its city and stratum. The inverse of these second stage probabilities of selection constituted the second stage weights for providers in the 9 cities where we sampled providers.

Estimates of the proportion of soup kitchen users who are homeless were used when allocating the sample among soup kitchens and shelters. When allocating the sample across provider types, we assumed that 65 percent of the individuals at soup kitchens were homeless except in Philadelphia and Manhattan where 50 percent and 80 percent were assumed homeless respectively.

The second-stage sample of shelter/meal sites was selected with probability proportional to the measure of size described above. Let $S(hifj)$ be the measure of size of provider j of provider type f within sample city hi and $m(hif)$ be the provider f sample size selected from city hi . Then within sample city hi , each sample provider had conditional probability $P_{2|1}(hifj)$ of selection where:

$$P_{2|1}(hifj) = m(hif) S(hifj) / S(hif+) \quad (5)$$

If fewer than $m(hif)$ type f providers exist within each site, than all of type f providers in that sample city were included with probability of selection equal to one. The conditional second-stage weight is calculated as:

$$W_{2|1}(hifj) = 1 / [P_{2|1}(hifj)] \quad (6)$$

For some cities and some provider types, the second-stage sample was fielded as an initial sample and a hold sample. If UI had obtained 100 percent cooperation, the initial sample would have yielded the requisite providers for interviewing purposes. The hold sample was used to supplement the initial sample as non-response occurred. For sample weighting purposes, the ultimate sample from city hi and provider type f may be regarded as the initial sample plus all hold sample providers used to supplement the initial sample.

Second Stage Non-response Adjustment

All responding and non-responding providers were considered members of the sample. Non-response resulted from the inability of interviewers to contact and make appointments to interview providers and from the refusal of those who were contacted to participate in the survey. Weighting classes were defined for each city by provider type. Non-response weighting classes were formed for soup kitchens, shelters with meals and shelters without meals for each city. The non-response weight that was developed for each weighting class is applied to each member of the weighting class.

The city in which non-response was highest for the provider sample was Queens. Only 9 out of the eligible 18 providers agreed to participate. Among soup kitchens, the non-response rate was even higher than that--only 2 of the 7 eligible providers agreed to participate. Because we believe that soup kitchens and shelters function in different ways, we preserved the demarcation and used the non-response weights that were calculated for each of the three provider types separately.

The weights for all provider-level data were computed as the product of the city weight, the conditional second-stage provider weight and the non-response adjustment. The final provider weights for providers within Reno were very large compared to the other weights. Reno was in a stratum that contained a large number of small cities. It had a small population size relative to the others in the stratum but was chosen nonetheless. As a consequence its city weight was 58.59 and the final weights were 58.59 for 5 of Reno's providers and

78.12 for 3 others due to non-response. The next highest weight in the provider sample was 25.

The disproportionate weight given to the Reno providers follows from the systematic development of weights, involving the inverse of the sample probabilities of inclusion leading to consistent estimation of population parameters. Because this procedure resulted in relatively large weights for facilities in Reno, the effect on the estimated means was analyzed. We have compared the means and variances of the weighted and un-weighted data and have found that while the weighted variances are consistently twice as high as the un-weighted variances, the weighted and un-weighted means and frequency counts are very close.

Moreover, we combined the stratum that contains Reno with the one that contains San Jose into one pseudo stratum--San Jose and Reno were paired because they are both western cities representing neighboring population sizes (small and medium). We then re-calculated the weights so that Reno's weights were lowered and San Jose's weights were raised, preserving the original combined total weight. We then calculated the means and variances of a set of 10 specifically chosen variables for the weights using Reno by itself, and the weights resulting from combining Reno and San Jose. We found that in all but two of the 10 cases the mean square error was lower for the provider weights using Reno alone than for the provider weights developed when Reno and San Jose were combined. Therefore, we decided to use the weights based on Reno alone because by using them we will have unbiased estimates and variances that are not significantly higher.

Weighting for the Sample of Homeless Respondents

The interviewing was conducted in two phases. First, Urban Institute (UI) interviewers collected data from the providers through in-person interviews. Second, Research Triangle Institute (RTI), under subcontract to UI, sent interviewers to the site and conducted the interviews with the homeless respondents. Therefore, we constructed the second-stage provider weights and non-response weights for the providers from which the individual sample was drawn, following the same procedures as for the provider interview sample. The provider weights for the individual sample differed from those of the provider sample because of differential non-response. RTI had some refusals and non-responding providers that UI had as respondents, and UI had some non-respondents that RTI had as responding providers. The former case predominated (42 providers) while the latter case was rare (3 providers). (See Table B-3 and related text.) New RTI-based non-response rates were calculated for each of the three weighting classes (three types of providers) in each city.

Third-stage Weight Component

Next, the systematic sampling that took place at each provider in the individual sample formed the basis for the third-stage weight component. A two-step procedure was employed at this stage. First, potential homeless people were screened to determine eligibility for the sample. If they were homeless and agreed to be interviewed, the interviewer proceeded to conduct the interview. Except for adjustments to reflect differential frequency of using providers and the multiplicity associated with differing use of soup kitchens and shelters, the conditional third-stage probability of selection of person k within shelter j of provider type f of city hi may be expressed as:

$$P_{3|2}(hifjk) = r(hifj) / R(hifj)$$

(7)

where

$r(hifj)$ is the sample size selected from the hij -th type f provider and $R(hifj)$ is the total population size associated with the hij -th type provider.

The information describing the systematic sampling of individuals was written on the site control form used by RTI interviewers. We formed a ratio for the third-stage probabilities of selection that depended on the number of screeners that were attempted and the estimated number of individuals at the site at the time of the interview. In 6 cases the latter piece of information was missing from the control form and had to be imputed by using the measure of size obtained during the Urban Institute interview. The number of screenings forms the numerator and the estimated number of clients forms the denominator in all other cases. This screening ratio becomes an estimate of the probability that a person was interviewed at the particular site, given that the site was chosen and that they were present when interviewing was taking place. The inverse of the conditional third-stage weight is then multiplied by the product of the weights developed at earlier stages. This component of the weight had a mean value of 14 and a standard deviation of 21. The minimum value was 1 and the maximum value was 217.

The ratio of the estimated number of clients to the attempted number of screeners was used as the third stage weight instead of the skip interval. We examined the consequence of using the ratio of the estimated number of clients at the time of the interview to the attempted number of screeners for the third stage weight in place of the skip interval that was employed by the interviewer to select the sample to be screened. For the facilities for which we have data on the skip interval (this information was missing from the control form for 5.8 percent of the facilities), the mean of the skip intervals was 11.6 while the mean for the ratio of estimated number of clients to the attempted number of screeners was 12.7 suggesting that our third stage weights are approximately 9 percent too high. While this indicates that estimates of population totals will also be biased upwards by 9 percent, estimates of the characteristics of the population should not be affected.

Third Stage Non-response Adjustment

Next, we adjusted for non-response among the homeless who were interviewed. Weighting classes were defined by city size and by the type of provider where we located the individual and conducted the interview. The four city size categories were cities with 100,000 to 250,000, cities with populations between 250,000 and 500,000, cities with populations between 500,000 and 1,000,000, and cities with populations over 1,000,000. The two provider types were soup kitchens and shelters (including both shelters with and shelters without meals). Non-response rates were calculated at both the screener and survey stages and the non-response adjustment was the inverse of the combined non-response rates. The weights of all the responding homeless persons were summed with the weights of all the non-responding homeless persons and then divided by the weights of all the responding homeless persons. This weighting class response adjustment was then applied to each respondent weight in the weighting class. For the whole sample, the average non-response adjustment was 1.12 reflecting an overall response rate among homeless respondents of 89 percent (100/112).

Frequency of Use Adjustment

A correction was then developed to account for the differential use of providers by the respondents. Here we conceptualize the sample as being divided into two parts--a shelter sample and a soup kitchen sample. Individuals interviewed at shelters (with or without meals) constitute the shelter sample. Individuals interviewed at soup kitchens constitute the soup kitchen sample. The frequency with which an individual uses the provider type at which he/she was interviewed influences the probability that he/she will be in the sample. The need for this correction arises from the fact that a homeless person who almost always uses shelters has a greater chance of selection than one who seldom uses shelters, and thus represents fewer other homeless persons. The adjustment for differential frequency of provider use was accomplished by multiplying the product of the earlier stage weights by the inverse of the proportion of the time the respondent used shelters during the preceding week for those interviewed at shelters. This information was taken from the individual interview in question H3.a. The adjustment is:

$$U_{sh} = 7/(H3.a) \quad (8).$$

This presumes that interviewing took place on a normal day for the provider--that the same number of people were there as usual. This is an appropriate assumption for shelters because they are uniformly open seven days a week and deviations from the norm can be assumed to average out. However, for soup kitchens, this assumption is not always valid because there is variability in the number of days per week soup kitchens serve meals. Because some soup kitchens were open once a week while others were open daily, a different adjustment was made for respondents interviewed at soup kitchens.

The following assumption about soup kitchen use was made: Let d = the number of days per week the soup kitchen is open. If a respondent is interviewed at a particular soup kitchen, it is assumed that he or she eats at that soup kitchen every day it is open, provided that the number of days he or she reports eating at soup kitchens ($H11.a$) is less than or equal to d (this was the case about two thirds of the time). If $H11.a$ is less than or equal to d , the conditional probability of being selected, given that the soup kitchen is sampled on the specified day is $(H11.a)/d$ and the appropriate adjustment to the basic sampling weight is:

$$U_{sk} = d/(H11.a) \text{ when } H11.a \text{ is less than or equal to } d \quad (9).$$

If $H11.a$ is greater than d , then the respondent must eat $H11.a - d$ days at other soup kitchens. Therefore, there is a higher probability of this individual being included in the sample, given that he could have been interviewed elsewhere at other soup kitchens. Let S equal the sum of the measures of size of all the sampled soup kitchens in a given city, divided by the sum of the measures of size of both sampled and nonsampled soup kitchens in that city. Let D equal the number of days open (in total) for all of the sample soup kit-

$$U_{sk}' = 1 / [1 + S(H11.a - d)/(D - d)] \text{ when } H11.a \text{ exceeds } d \quad (10)$$

constitutes the factor by which the basic sampling weight is adjusted.

Of the respondents interviewed at soup kitchens, U_{sk} was calculated for 62 percent while U_{sk}' was calculated for the remaining 38 percent. Using the unweighted values from the sample, the average values of U_{sh} , U_{sk} and U_{sk}' are 2.91, 1.69 and .94, respectively for a combined frequency of use adjustment of 1.88 overall. We calculated the weights that result from omitting this frequency of use adjustment and evaluated the sum. Overall, the frequency of use adjustment led to an increase in the weights of about 70 percent--in other words, the weights that take into account frequency of use and reflect a seven day period as a basis for analysis are about 1.7 times as high as those that assume that the respondent uses the facility at which he/she was interviewed every day that the facility is open.

Realignment of Weights For Homeless Who Use Both Soup Kitchens and Shelters

The sum of the weights of the individuals at shelters who only use shelters is a consistent estimate of the homeless population that only uses shelters. The same is true for the sample of users of soup kitchens who use only soup kitchens. We have two distinct, consistent estimates of the homeless population that uses both; the sum of the weights of the homeless who were interviewed at soup kitchens but also use shelters and the sum of the weights of the homeless interviewed at shelters who also use soup kitchens. We used the weighted average of these two estimates to make this final realignment for users of both types of providers. We have chosen weights that reflect their relative sample sizes.

Let n_{sk} = number of respondents interviewed at soup kitchens, and
 n_{sh} = number of respondents interviewed at shelters. Then:

$$p_{sk} = n_{sk} / (n_{sk} + n_{sh}) \quad (11)$$

$$p_{sh} = n_{sh} / (n_{sk} + n_{sh}) \quad (12)$$

where p_{sh} and p_{sk} sum to one.

All those interviewed at soup kitchens who reported that they had used a shelter in the past week had their basic sampling weights multiplied by p_{sk} and all those who were interviewed at shelters who reported that they had used a soup kitchen in the past week had their basic sampling weights multiplied by p_{sh} . In our sample p_{sk} and p_{sh} equal .4 and .6 respectively. All those at shelters who reported no soup kitchen use and those at soup kitchens who reported no shelter use have no change in their basic sampling weights. This yields correctly weighted data for analysis of all service users combined and separately for the three types of users (shelters only, soup kitchens only, and users of both).

When using the un-imputed weights, we find that the estimate of the users of both soup kitchens and shelters based on the soup kitchen sample is 87,900 while it is 65,272 based on the shelter sample. The estimate we used of those who use both soup kitchens and shelters is the weighted average, or 74,323. This weighted average is calculated, exclusively for those who reported using both soup kitchens and shelters, by assigning a final correction of .4 to the

weight of anyone interviewed at a soup kitchen and .6 to the weight of anyone interviewed at a shelter.

Population Estimate and Confidence Interval

Upon completion of the above-listed steps we undertook an analysis of our weights. The sum of the weights was 194,017; this is also an estimate of the total user population over a seven day period in March in the defined universe. The 95 percent confidence interval around the estimated total is 112,124 to 275,910. The fact that the size of the 95 percent confidence interval is almost as large as the estimate itself indicates how imprecise this estimate is. This imprecision is not surprising given the fact that the measures of size used to draw the sample were not closely related to the size of the service-using homeless population in the sample cities. In addition to the large imprecision associated with this estimate, it is likely that this estimate is biased upwards by about 15 percent. The sources of bias are discussed below.

Possible Sources and Extent of Bias in the Estimated Total

There are three reasons why this estimate of the total is likely to be biased. When all sources of bias are considered together, the combined upward bias is 15 percent.

The first source of bias was described in the section on third stage weighting. Using the ratio of the estimated number of clients to the screeners attempted in place of the skip interval is likely to bias upward the estimated total by 9.5 percent.

Second, while the use of multiple soup kitchens within a week has been accounted for, the possible use of multiple soup kitchens on a given day has not incorporated into the weights because no exact adjustment can be made. However, the upward bias that results from ignoring meals eaten at multiple soup kitchens on a given day and meals provided at multiple meal times was estimated to be at most 5.3 percent.

An implicit assumption underlying the frequency of use adjustment is that on any given day homeless individuals use the soup kitchen at which they were interviewed exclusively and are present at each of the soup kitchen's meal times within a day. To the extent that homeless individuals tend to use more than one soup kitchen a day, the sample weights for those interviewed at soup kitchens will be biased upwards. On the other hand, to the extent that homeless individuals use the soup kitchen less frequently on a daily basis than the soup kitchen at which they were interviewed is open, the sample weights will be biased downwards.

We are not able to make an exact daily frequency of use adjustment to assess the effects of these possible service use patterns, because the questionnaire did not include detailed enough questions on daily eating locations. We did, however, attempt to gauge the likely direction and magnitude of this possible source of bias by examining the number of meals per day respondents reported eating, relative to how many meal times the soup kitchens where we located and interviewed them served meals.

Of the respondents interviewed at soup kitchens, 51 percent eat more often per day than the meal times that the soup kitchen is open, 37 percent eat as often, and 14 percent eat less often. No daily frequency of use adjustment is required for those who eat as often as the soup kitchen at which they were interviewed is open.

For those who eat more often, the probabilities of selection have been understated and thus their weights are biased upwards. If we make the simplifying assumption that they eat twice as often per day as the soup kitchen where they were interviewed is open, their weights should be adjusted downward by one-half. For those who eat less often, the probabilities of selection have been overstated and their weights are biased downward. If we assume that the soup kitchen is open twice as often per day as they eat, their weights should be adjusted upward by a factor of two.

The sum of the weights of those who eat more frequently per day is 29,733. When halved, the sum is 14,866. The sum of the weights of those who eat less frequently per day is 5,835. When doubled the sum is 11,670. If these adjustments are made the net effect on the sum of the weights is a decline of 9,031. This would indicate that the above estimate of the total number of service-using homeless is biased upwards by 5.29 percent. (The net effect was also calculated using the actual number of times per day respondents ate and the number of meal times per day the soup kitchen served meals, which produced an upward bias estimate of 5.88 percent.) Either estimate of bias is likely to be an overstatement or upper estimate of the bias because we have assumed the worst case (that all meals respondents report eating are eaten at soup kitchens). To the extent that those found at soup kitchens eat some of their meals at other places the upward bias in the weights will decline.

The third source of bias is the fact that the sample frame of facilities was not complete for all cities. In any study that must develop an original sampling frame, there is some likelihood that this first-time effort will miss some sampling units that should have been included. This study had to develop original sampling frames of all providers of food and shelter for the homeless in each of the 20 cities in our city sample. While every effort was expended to make these provider lists complete, inevitably some facilities were missed. Although one would hope that these omissions were random, there is at least one systematic component to the missing providers in the present sample. That omission concerns voucher programs that pay for lodging for homeless persons, often in hotels and motels.

Our sample contains some voucher programs, and omits others. In four of our sampled cities, Bridgeport, Los Angeles, Madison and Seattle, city, county or state government pays for vouchers that go to non-profit providers for ultimate distribution to their homeless clients. The non-profit providers that handle the vouchers in these cities, and their homeless clients, were part of our provider and homeless individual samples. In New York, the hotels that house homeless families and individuals through a city voucher system were part of our provider and homeless individual samples. And in Philadelphia all providers contracted through the city were part of our sampling frame.

However, in four cities, Chicago, Cleveland, Los Angeles and Pittsburgh, we did not identify and include in our provider sample certain hotels or motels that house 10 or more homeless households. In Los Angeles three hotels were

under contract in March 1987 to Los Angeles County to honor vouchers issued to homeless single persons who had applied for General Assistance. The average number of homeless single persons housed in hotels with these vouchers per week in Los Angeles during March 1987 was approximately 60, and our population estimate is biased downward by this much as a result of this omission. In Chicago hotel and motel voucher accommodations are used for homeless families, and 192 such families were served in March 1987. In the stratum represented by Cleveland, 10 homeless families were missed, and in the stratum represented by Pittsburgh 104 homeless families were missed. Thus our estimate of homeless families is biased downward by approximately 300-350 households of this type.

The total underestimate due to omission of voucher hotels and motels in these cities is 300-400 of the overall estimate of 194,017. This is a negligible downward bias of 0.2 percent.

Imputation of Weights for Analysis of Characteristics of Homeless Respondents

The mean of the weights equalled 114 with a standard error of 24.52. The range was .6122 to 17,384. The upper value in the range of 17,384 corresponded to the weight of a person interviewed at a soup kitchen in Reno. Data from that one individual contributes 9 percent and, altogether, the stratum representing Reno contributes 23 percent to the estimates of population characteristics.

Because including or excluding that one person has a material effect on overall estimates of population characteristics and because the unadjusted sample weights produce estimates with large standard errors, we have chosen to consider the soup kitchen weights for Reno to be a missing value and to impute a value based on the marginal proportions soup kitchens are of other services and the marginal proportion the Reno stratum is of other strata. The cities constituted the rows and soup kitchen or shelter survey constituted the columns in the missing value imputation process.

Because the shelter survey for Reno produced 24 observations whose weights were all within reasonable bounds, they were retained. However, the soup kitchen survey yielded only 12 observations, some of whose weights were irrationally large; these weights were replaced by imputed weights. This adjustment led to an adjustment downward in all the weights of Reno soup kitchen users, of .3515. This imputation preserved the relative sizes of the Reno soup kitchen weights with respect to one another.

The mean of the imputed weights is 102, with a standard error of 17.36; a minimum of .6122 and a maximum of 6110. The mean square error was calculated for four variables of particular interest and in three of the four cases, the means calculated using the imputed weights had lower mean square errors than the means calculated using the original values. In the fourth case, the mean square errors were the same. Because the mean square error is consistently lower and because the imputed Reno soup kitchen weights are more realistically related to the other weights in the sample, the imputed weights are used as the basis for the analysis of the respondent data. While estimates of user characteristics based on the imputed weights are no longer unbiased, the resulting bias is likely to be small while the gain in precision is likely to be large.

Other Sampling Issues--Duplicate Interviews

Occasionally interviewers sampled the same individual twice. This might occur if that individual was at one shelter on the day the interviewer went there, and at another facility--say a soup kitchen--on the day the interviewer went to that provider. If the interviewer recognized the respondent as one who had been previously interviewed, or if the respondent informed the interviewer that he or she had already participated, the interview was coded as a duplicate and broken off. Table B-6 shows the number of duplicates that occurred, and the cities where they happened. As can be seen, this was a phenomenon mostly in small cities, with four of the five small cities indicating at least one duplicate.

Estimating Variances for Strata with Only One Sampled City

Although our sampling plan contained 17 strata, 8 of these strata that were not certainty cities were represented in the final sample by only one city. To calculate variances for these strata, we must pair each single-city stratum with another single-city stratum to construct "pseudo strata." By

TABLE B-6
Number of Duplicate Interviews

<u>City</u>	<u>Number of Duplicates</u>
Memphis	7
San Jose	4
Seattle	4
Bridgeport	15
Madison	1
Reno	6
Waco	2
All other cities	0

collapsing the strata containing only one primary sample unit, we will be able to make variance computations and assess the effect of the multi-stage design on the sample variance. While this method is necessary for calculating variances, it leads to estimates of the sample variances that are usually biased upward. It thus errs, if it errs, on the conservative side of any test of statistical significance. The other cities pose no problems for variance estimation--the three southern strata produced two draws per stratum while two selections were taken from the New York stratum and the certainty cities were the only members of their strata. Table B-7 presents the pairings we made to create the necessary pseudo strata. Strata were paired by city size except for Reno and San Jose, which are cities in adjacent city size categories that are both in the West.

TABLE B-7
Pseudo Strata

Reno San Jose
Madison Bridgeport
Cleveland Pittsburgh
Seattle Saint Louis
B-25

The Population Estimate: Issues and Limitations

Throughout, this presentation of weighting has mentioned different adjustments and realignments of the weights, each of which has an effect on the final weight. Here we summarize the effects of the adjustments we made. We also present the likely or estimated effects of adjustments we did not make. In this latter category are placed the results of weighting techniques or approaches about which reasonable statisticians may differ. We have made the calculations, and present the results so that readers may draw their own conclusions about the appropriateness and importance of each potential adjustment.

Adjustments We Did Make, and Their Effects

Frequency of Use Adjustment. This adjustment takes account of how often individuals use soup kitchens and shelters. It gives less weight to frequent users and more weight to infrequent users, on the grounds that the frequent users had a higher probability of selection for our sample and infrequent users had a lower probability of selection. The population estimate without the frequency of use adjustment is 110,334. With the frequency of use adjustment the population estimate is 194,017. Thus the frequency of use adjustment produces an increase in the population estimate of 83,683, which is a 75.8 percent increase over the estimate without the frequency of use adjustment.

Realignment for Those Who Use Both Soup Kitchens and Shelters. The final estimate of homeless persons who use both soup kitchens and shelters is 74,320. This estimate is roughly half of what it would have been had we not realigned the weights to account for the fact that people who used both types of facilities had twice the probability of selection as those who only used one type of facility. Without this realignment the population estimate would have been 272,868; with the realignment it is 194,017. Thus the population estimate for homeless adults would have been 78,851 higher without this realignment.

To summarize:

Frequency of use adjustment --increases estimate by 83,683

Realignment for those who use
both soup kitchens and shelters --decreases estimate by 78,851

<u>Adjustment</u>	<u>Estimate</u>	<u>Standard Error of the Estimate</u>	<u>Confidence Interval</u>
Basic estimate	194,017	41,784	± 81,893
Estimate without frequency of use adjustment	110,334	17,619	± 34,534
Estimate with frequency of use adjustment, but before realigning for those who use both soup kitchens and shelters	272,868	56,266	±110,281

Adjustments We Did Not Make, and Their Effects

Reduce Reno Weights. We adjusted the weights of soup kitchen users in Reno, as described above, in all of our analyses of data describing the homeless population. The argument could be made that the total population estimate should also be reduced, using the imputed weights for Reno rather than the unimputed weights. Were one to make this change, the size of the population estimate would be reduced by 19,786, or 10.2 percent.

Adjust for Multiple Soup Kitchen Use Within a Day. As described above, some people ate more meals in soup kitchens than were served by the soup kitchen where we found them, implying that they might have had additional chances at selection into the sample when they were eating at other soup kitchens. If one adjusted for this multiplicity effect, the size of the population estimate would be reduced by about 9,013, or 5.3 percent.

Use Skip Interval Rather than Estimate-to-Screener Ratio. As described above, we used the ratio of provider estimate of population size to the number of screeners attempted in calculating our third-stage weight component. If we had used the skip interval, we would have achieved a smaller overall population estimate, by about 18,398, which is 9.5 percent of the final estimate of 194,017.

Add Homeless Users of Voucher Programs. If we add the people missed because some voucher programs were omitted from the sampling frame in some cities, we would increase the population by approximately 300-400. Of these, approximately 60 are single men in Los Angeles, and 300-350 are homeless households with children in Chicago (192) and in the strata represented by Cleveland (10) and Pittsburgh (104).

To summarize:

Adjustments that would reduce the size of the estimates:

Reduce Reno weights	down by 19,786 (10.2%)
Adjust for multiple soup kitchen use within a day	down by 9,013 (5.3%)
Use skip interval instead of provider estimate divided by screeners attempted	down by 18,398 (9.5%)

Adjustment that would increase the size of the estimates:

Add population of omitted voucher programs	up by approximately 400 (0.0%)
Net effects of adjustments not made	down by 43,197 (22.3%)

SECTION C

STUDY INSTRUMENTS

Provider Interview
Provider Meal Observation Form
Individual Interview Screener
Individual Interview
Local Food Stamp Office Interview

Provider ID # _____

OMB Clearance No. 05840360
Expires 9/30/87

CITY _____	DATE OF INT. <u> </u> / <u> </u> / <u> </u>
PROVIDER AGENCY _____	TIME (incl. am/pm) _____
ADDRESS _____	Start: _____
RESPONDENT _____	End: _____
R'S POSITION _____ PHONE _____	Int. Name _____

DESCRIPTION OF FACILITY

1. What services do you provide? Do you charge for them?

SERVICE		CHARGE		IF YES, HOW MUCH?
YES	NO	YES	NO	
1	2	a. shelter.....1...2.....		_____
1	2	b. meals/food.....1...2.....		_____
1	2	c. storage for personal items.....1...2.....		_____
1	2	d. shower/shave facilities.....1...2.....		_____
1	2	e. laundry facilities.....1...2.....		_____
1	2	f. religious services.....1...2.....		_____
1	2	g. job placement.....1...2.....		_____
1	2	h. job training placement/referral..1...2.....		_____
1	2	i. mail receiving.....1...2.....		_____
1	2	j. social work counseling/casework..1...2.....		_____
1	2	k. legal services/referral.....1...2.....		_____
1	2	l. clothing.....1...2.....		_____
1	2	m. recreation.....1...2.....		_____
1	2	n. health care on site.....1...2.....		_____
1	2	o. health care by referral.....1...2.....		_____
1	2	p. carfare/transportation.....1...2.....		_____
1	2	q. other (SPECIFY) _____		_____
		r. DON'T KNOW.....94		
		s. REFUSED.....97		

COMMENTS:

2. In the past YEAR, has your organization added to or subtracted from the services you were providing?

yes, added.....1
yes, subtracted.....2
no.....3 (SKIP TO Q3)
DON'T KNOW.....94
REFUSED.....97

- 2a. Which services were (added/subtracted)?

- 2b. IF ADDED: Why did you make this change?

Noticed a gap in the services available in the community.....1
Change in the population being served.....2
Had more resources available.....3
Had more volunteers available.....4
Other (SPECIFY).....
DON'T KNOW.....94
REFUSED.....97

- 2c. IF ADDED: Where did you get the resources to add the (service)?

- 2d. IF SUBTRACTED: Why did you make this change?

Duplication of services available in the community.....1
Change in the population being served.....2
Rising costs.....3
Fewer volunteers.....4
Other (SPECIFY).....
.....5
DON'T KNOW.....94
REFUSED.....97

3. Do homeless people use your address as a place to receive food stamps?

yes.....1
no.....2

4. What percentage of the homeless people who use your facilities receive food stamps? (ESTIMATE)

| | | %

DON'T KNOW.....94
REFUSED.....97

4a. What information did you use to come up with this percent figure?

5. Do you help your clients get food stamps?

yes.....1
no.....2 (SKIP TO Q7)
DON'T KNOW.....94
REFUSED.....97

5a. Do you help them in any of the following ways? YES NO

Encourage them to apply.....1....2
Help them fill out
applications, assemble
documentation, go with
them to apply.....1....2
Write supporting letter.....1....2
Other (SPECIFY)1....2
DON'T KNOW.....94
REFUSED.....97

6. In your experience, how easy is it for homeless people to get food stamps in this city? (READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES)

Very easy.....1
 Somewhat easy.....2
 Somewhat hard.....3
 Very hard.....4
 DON'T KNOW.....94
 REFUSED.....97

- 6a. What makes it (easy/hard)?

NETWORKS

7. How long has your organization been operating services for the homeless? (IF THE ORGANIZATION HAS MORE THAN ONE FACILITY OR OPERATION, ASK THIS QUESTION ONLY WITH RESPECT TO THE FACILITY WHERE YOU ARE.)

| | years

less than one year.....00
 DON'T KNOW.....94
 REFUSED.....97

8. Are you officially affiliated with any church, charity or national organization?

yes.....1
 no.....2
 DON'T KNOW.....94
 REFUSED.....97

SKIP TO Q9

- 8a. What is your affiliation?

12a. What percentage of beds are full on most nights in March?

100% or more.....1
 about 90%.....2
 between 75% and 90%.....3
 less than 75%.....4
 DON'T KNOW.....94
 REFUSED.....97

13. Now I'd like to ask you about the people who use your shelter services.
 Is everyone who uses your shelter services homeless?

yes.....1 (SKIP TO Q14)
 no.....2
 DON'T KNOW.....94
 REFUSED.....97

13a. What percent of your shelter users would you say are not homeless?

percent

DON'T KNOW.....94
 REFUSED.....97

13b. Who are the people who are not homeless (how would you describe them)?

14. Among the homeless people who use your shelter, what percentage have been homeless for:

PERCENTAGE

a. less than six months.....
 b. 6 months - 2 years.....
 c. 3 years or more.....
 d. DON'T KNOW.....94
 e. REFUSED.....97

15. Do you serve the following types of homeless people?

	YES	NO	DK	PERCENT OF THOSE SERVED
a. Single men.....	1	2	8 <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
b. Single women.....	1	2	8 <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
c. Single women with children.....	1	2	8 <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
d. Whole families (couple w/children)..	1	2	8 <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
e. Other (SPECIFY) _____				<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
f. DON'T KNOW.....				94
g. REFUSED.....				97

16. About what percentage of those you serve are (FIRST CATEGORY MENTIONED IN Q15)? ASK FOR EACH CATEGORY MENTIONED AND RECORD ABOVE.

17. I'd like to ask about the typical ages of the homeless you serve. Which of the following age groups make up at least one quarter of your homeless people?

	YES	NO	DK
a. Children (under 18).....	1	2	8
b. Young men/women (under 30).....	1	2	8
c. Middle aged men/women (30-50).....	1	2	8
d. Older men/women (50-65).....	1	2	8
e. The elderly (65+).....	1	2	8
f. DON'T KNOW.....			
g. REFUSED.....			

18. Of the homeless people who use your shelter services, what percentage are:

a. Black.....			
b. White, not Hispanic.....			
c. Hispanic.....			
d. American Indian.....			
e. Asian.....			
f. Other (SPECIFY) _____			
g. DON'T KNOW.....	94		
h. REFUSED.....	97		

19. Among the homeless people using your shelter, which of the following would you say are major problems, that is, a problem for at least one quarter of those you serve? (READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES)

YES NO DK

a. Alcoholism.....	1...2...8
b. Drug Abuse.....	1...2...8
c. Mental Illness.....	1...2...8
d. Inability to find or hold a job.....	1...2...8
e. Physical disability.....	1...2...8
f. Domestic violence/battering.....	1...2...8
g. Other (SPECIFY) _____	1...2...8
h. DON'T KNOW.....	94
i. REFUSED.....	97

20. Do you have a standard policy about how long homeless people can stay in your shelter?

yes.....	1	(SKIP TO Q21)
no.....	2	
DON'T KNOW.....	94	
REFUSED.....	97	

20a. What is your policy?

21. What is the average length of stay for homeless people in your shelter?

Average # of days

| | |

Longest, or, an unusually long stay

| | |

Shortest

| | |

MEAL SERVICES

22. CHECK HERE IF MEAL SERVICE AVAILABLE ☐

IF CHECKED, ASK Q23

IF NOT CHECKED, SKIP TO Q47

23. Now I'd like to ask you about the meals you provide to homeless people.
What days does your organization serve meals?

CIRCLE ALL
THAT APPLY

Monday.....1
Tuesday.....2
Wednesday.....3
Thursday.....4
Friday.....5
Saturday.....6
Sunday.....7
DON'T KNOW.....94
REFUSED.....97

24. Are you closed for any period of time during the year?

Never.....1
One Week.....2
Two Weeks.....3
One Month.....4
Summer Months.....5
Holidays.....6
Other (SPECIFY).....7

25. Which of the following meals do you serve at this site?

	YES	NO	AVERAGE NO. MEALS PER DAY
a. Breakfast	1	2	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
b. Lunch	1	2	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
c. Supper	1	2	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
d. Snacks	1	2	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>

26. Approximately how many (meal types) are served on a typical day? ASK EACH
TYPE MENTIONED AND RECORD ABOVE

27. When you are not serving meals what are the sources of food for your homeless clients?

CIRCLE ALL
THAT APPLY

Other Soup Kitchens.....1
Other Shelters.....2
Food Wagons.....3
Restaurant Back doors or dumpsters.....4
Restaurants where they pay (e.g., McDonalds).....5
Food Pantry/Food box.....6
Grocery Store.....7
Trash Can.....8
Friends or relatives.....9
Other (SPECIFY).....10
DON'T KNOW.....94
REFUSED.....97

28. What type of food service operation do you use?

On-Site Preparation.....1
Vended Prepared Meals.....2
Prepared in Central Kitchen and Delivered.....3
Donated Prepared Meals.....4
Other (SPECIFY).....5
DON'T KNOW.....94
REFUSED.....97

29. Do you have a license from the health department to operate a food service facility, soup kitchen or restaurant?

yes.....1
no.....2
DON'T KNOW.....94
REFUSED.....97

30. How often during a month have you had to turn homeless people away because you ran out of food?

Never.....1
Once a Month.....2
Twice a Month.....3
Once a Week.....4
Two or More Times a Week.....5
DON'T KNOW.....94
REFUSED.....97

ASK Q30a

30a. When you do have to turn people away, about how many people are you unable to feed because you ran out of food?

(ESTIMATE)

DON'T KNOW.....94
REFUSED.....97

31. Do you often have any leftover meals or parts of meals after you finish serving?

yes.....1
no.....2 (SKIP TO Q32)

31a. IF YES: What do you do with them?

32. Which of the following describes your meal service (READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES):

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY

YES NO

- a. Standard portion sizes are served.....1....2
- b. People can get as much as they want.....1....2
- c. People can usually get seconds.....1....2

IF THE SITE ALSO PROVIDES SHELTER SERVICES ASK Q33
OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q34

33. Are all of the people who use your meal services the same homeless people who use your shelter services?

yes, shelter and meal recipients are the
 same, no extras at meals.....1 (SKIP TO Q41)
 no, there are many people at our meals in
 addition to those who use our shelter.....2 (ASK Qs 34-40
 ABOUT THOSE WHO
 GET ONLY MEALS)
 no, none of our shelter people get our
 meals, but many other people do.....3 (ASK Qs 34-40
 ABOUT THOSE WHO
 GET MEALS)
 DON'T KNOW.....94
 REFUSED.....97

34. I'd like to ask you about the people who use your meal services. Is everyone who uses your meal services homeless?

yes.....1 (SKIP TO Q35)
 no.....2
 DON'T KNOW.....94
 REFUSED.....97

34a. What percent of your meal users would you say are not homeless?

| | | percent

34b. Who are the people who are not homeless (how would you describe them)?

35. Among the homeless people who use your meal service, what percentage have been homeless for:

PERCENTAGE

a. less than six months.....| | |
 b. 6 months - 2 years.....| | |
 c. 3 years or more.....| | |
 d. DON'T KNOW.....94
 e. REFUSED.....97

36. Do you serve the following types of homeless people?

	YES	NO	DK	PERCENT OF THOSE SERVED
a. Single men.....	1...	2...	8.....	__ __ __
b. Single women.....	1...	2...	8.....	__ __ __
c. Single women with children.....	1...	2...	8.....	__ __ __
d. Whole families (couple w/children)..	1...	2...	8.....	__ __ __
e. Other (SPECIFY) _____				__ __ __
f. DON'T KNOW.....				94
g. REFUSED.....				97

37. About what percentage of those you serve are (FIRST CATEGORY MENTIONED IN Q36.) ASK FOR EACH CATEGORY MENTIONED AND RECORD ABOVE.

38. I'd like to ask about the typical ages of the homeless you serve. Which of the following age groups make up at least one quarter of your homeless people?

	YES	NO	DK
a. Children (under 18).....	1...	2...	8
b. Young men/women (under 30).....	1...	2...	8
c. Middle aged men/women (30-50).....	1...	2...	8
d. Older men/women (50-75).....	1...	2...	8
e. The elderly (65+).....	1...	2...	8
f. DON'T KNOW.....			94
g. REFUSED.....			97

39. Of the homeless people who use your MEAL services, what percentage are:

a. Black.....			
b. White, not Hispanic.....			
c. Hispanic.....			
d. American Indian.....			
e. Asian.....			
f. Other (SPECIFY) _____			
g. DON'T KNOW.....	94		
h. REFUSED.....	97		

40. Among the homeless people using your meal services, which of the following would you say are major problems, that is, a problem for at least one quarter of those you serve? (READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES)

	YES	NO	DK
a. Alcoholism.....	1	2	8
b. Drug Abuse.....	1	2	8
c. Mental Illness.....	1	2	8
d. Inability to find and hold a job.....	1	2	8
e. Physical disability.....	1	2	8
f. Domestic violence/battering.....	1	2	8
g. Other (SPECIFY) _____	1	2	8
h. DON'T KNOW.....	94		
i. REFUSED.....	97		

SOURCES OF INCOME, GOODS AND SERVICES

41. Are your meals free, is there a fixed charge, or do you ask for voluntary contributions?

free.....	1 (SKIP TO 042)
fixed charge.....	2
voluntary contribution.....	3
DON'T KNOW.....	94
REFUSED.....	97

41a. What is the (charge/average donation)?

Breakfast \$ | | . | |

Lunch (noon meal) \$ | | . | |

Dinner (evening meal) \$ | | . | |

41b. How do you determine what to (charge/ask) for your meals?

42. What are your annual (last year's) cash expenses for food/meal services in the following categories: (READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES)

- a. Food.....\$,
- b. Labor.....\$,
- c. Supplies (paper goods, etc.).....\$,
- d. Rent.....\$,
- e. Overhead (utilities, trash collection, insurance, gasoline, etc.).....\$,
- f. Other recurring costs..... ,
- g. DON'T KNOW.....94
- h. REFUSED.....97

43. Was this a typical year's expenses?

- yes.....1 (SKIP TO 044)
- no.....2
- DON'T KNOW.....94
- REFUSED.....97

43a. Why was last year not typical? (PROBES: RENOVATIONS. FOOD SERVICE EQUIPMENT PURCHASE, OTHER EQUIPMENT PURCHASE-VANS, ETC.. START-UP COSTS)

44. Do you get cash income for your MEAL services from: (READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES)

	YES	NO	DK
a. User donations/charges.....	1	2	8
b. Churches.....	1	2	8
c. Corporations.....	1	2	8
d. Individual Donors (not users).....	1	2	8
e. Foundations.....	1	2	8
f. United Way (or equiv).....	1	2	8
g. Local government.....	1	2	8
h. State government.....	1	2	8
i. Federal government.....	1	2	8
j. DON'T KNOW (to whole Q).....			94
k. REFUSED.....			97

44a. What are your two biggest sources of cash income?

1. _____ Pct? _____

2. _____ Pct? _____

DON'T KNOW.....94
REFUSED.....97

45. Do you get the food you use everyday from: (READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES)

a. Retail purchase.....	1	2	8
b. Wholesale purchase.....	1	2	8
c. Government (USDA) surplus commodities.....	1	2	8
d. Food banks (exclusive of USDA commodities).....	1	2	8
e. Donations from local stores.....	1	2	8
f. Donations from food producers, bakeries, canneries, etc.....	1	2	8
g. Donations from religious or charitable organizations.....	1	2	8
h. Other (SPECIFY) _____	1	2	8
i. DON'T KNOW.....			94
j. REFUSED.....			97

45a. What are your two biggest sources of food?

1. _____ Pct? _____

2. _____ Pct? _____

46. How many people assist with meal services (that is, food purchasing, pick-up, preparation, service and clean-up)?

	# PEOPLE	TOTAL HOURS PER WEEK	PERCENTAGE OF WORK
Paid staff			
Volunteers			

46a. What are the total hours worked per week for meal services? (CODE ABOVE)

46b. What percentage of the work involved in meal services is done by (paid staff/volunteers)? (CODE ABOVE)

46c. Does anyone among your staff or volunteers working on your meal program have any training or experience (other than here) in nutrition or food service work?

yes.....1 (ASK Q 46d)
no.....2
DON'T KNOW.....94
REFUSED.....97

46d. Please describe this training or experience.

NOW SKIP TO Q51

47. Where do your homeless people currently get food?

CIRCLE ALL
THAT APPLY

Other soup kitchens.....1
Other shelters.....2
Restaurants (Back doors, dumpsters).....3
Restaurants where they pay.....4
Food pantry.....5
Grocery store.....6
Trash can.....7
Friends or relatives.....8
Other (SPECIFY)9
DON'T KNOW.....94
REFUSED.....97

48. Do you have the physical facilities to meet licensing standards to provide meals?

yes.....1
no.....2
DON'T KNOW.....94
REFUSED.....97

49. Are you thinking about expanding your services to provide one or more meals?

yes.....1
no.....2 (SKIP TO Q51)

50. What factors (are you considering/did you consider) in making these decisions (to expand or not to)?

PREPARED MEALS

51. Before we contacted you for this study, had you heard about the provisions that allow homeless people to exchange food stamps for low-cost prepared meals in facilities like yours (as opposed to using them only in grocery stores)?

yes.....1
no.....2
DON'T KNOW.....94
REFUSED.....97

51a. Have you applied to be able to accept food stamps, or are you thinking about applying?

Have applied.....1
Thinking about applying.....2
Decided not to apply.....3
DON'T KNOW.....94
REFUSED.....97

51b. What factors influenced your (decision/thinking)?

52. Do you think that the provisions to permit homeless people to exchange food stamps for prepared meals will affect the community of providers in (THIS CITY) serving the homeless?

yes.....1
no.....2
maybe.....3
DON'T KNOW.....94
REFUSED.....97

52a. Why or why not?

52b. What advantages do you see associated with the provisions?

52c. What disadvantages or problems do you see with the provisions?

53. Do you have any suggestions on how to improve the feeding of the homeless?

54. Could you briefly explain your philosophy or goals for providing services to the homeless? (PROBES: REHABILITATION, SELF-SUFFICIENCY, MAINTENANCE)

Meal Observations:

What meal did you observe: Morning meal
Noon meal
Evening meal
Snack

How many separate observations did you make (i.e., "meal A," "meal B," etc.)?
(this means you have a separate Food Portion Analysis form for each observation):

1 2 3 4 5

Have you written the Provider ID #, the date and day of observation, the Observation # and % of meals for that Observation, and your name on each separate Food Portion Analysis?

The only acceptable answer is "Yes!" Do it now!

Have you edited your Food Portion Analysis forms for this site, making sure all entries are clear and legible? Do it now!

TO BE CODED AFTER THE INTERVIEW IS COMPLETED

HOW COOPERATIVE WAS THE SITE STAFF WITH YOU IN YOUR DATA COLLECTION EFFORTS?

CIRCLE

ONE CODE

Totally Cooperative.....1
Mostly Cooperative.....2
Moderately Cooperative.....3
Mostly Un-Cooperative.....4
Totally Un-Cooperative.....5

COMMENTS:

If you would like to receive a copy of the Executive Summary of the results of this study, please give us your name and mailing address.

Name _____

Organization _____

Address _____

Observation # _____ % of meals _____ Provider ID # _____
 Date _____ Day _____

FOOD PORTION ANALYSIS

55. Code meal type being observed:

Morning meal.....1
 Noon meal.....2
 Evening meal.....3
 Snack.....4

INT. Name: _____

MEAL COMPONENT	FOOD DESCRIPTION	APPROXIMATE SIZE/UNIT	# OF UNITS SERVED
MILK			
MEAT; MEAT ALTERNATIVE	1. _____		
	2. _____		
VEGETABLE/ FRUIT	1. _____		
	2. _____		
	3. _____		
BREAD	1. _____		
	2. _____		
OTHER	1. _____		
	2. _____		
	3. _____		

56. Comments: _____

Interviewer: _____ ID No.: _____

PREPARED MEALS FOR THE HOMELESS PROJECT
SCREENING QUESTIONNAIRE

Sponsored By:

Food and Nutrition Service

Conducted By:

Urban Institute
Research Triangle Institute

Date of Interview: ____/____/____

Respondent Name: _____

Time Interview
Started: : AM
PMTime Interview
Ended: : AM
PM

Screening Result Codes (Circle One)

- 01 - Respondent Eligible
- 02 - Respondent Ineligible
- 03 - Refusal
- 04 - Breakoff
- 05 - Language Barrier
- 06 - Duplicate
- 07 - Unable to Locate
- 08 - Beds/Seats Selected - Not
Occupied
- 09 - Beds/Seats Selected - Occupied
But Not Screened
- 10 - Other (SPECIFY) _____

INTRODUCTION

Hello, I'm (YOUR NAME) from the Research Triangle Institute. We're conducting a survey of homeless people for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I'd like to ask a few questions about you and where you stay. If you are eligible, I would then like to ask you some additional questions. There are no known risks or direct benefits to you for participating in this study. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time or to refuse to answer any or all questions. All of your answers and any information that would permit your identification will be held in strict confidence.

SCREENING

S1. As of today, do you have some place here in (CITY NAME) that you consider to be your home or the place where you live?

Yes.....	01	
No.....	02	
Don't know.....	94	} (SKIP TO Q.S2)
Refused.....	97	

S1a. Is that an apartment; a room, a house, a shelter, or some other kind of place?

An apartment.....	01	
A room.....	02	
A house.....	03	
Dormitory hotel (place without separate rooms that you pay for yourself).....	04	
Hotel (place with separate rooms that you pay for yourself).....	05	
A shelter.....	06	} (SKIP TO Q.S2)
A welfare or voucher hotel.....	07	
A spot in a public place (e.g., park bench, bench in bus station, etc.).....	08	
The streets.....	09	
An abandoned building.....	10	
A car or truck.....	11	
Some other place (SPECIFY): _____	12	
Don't know.....	94	
Refused.....	97	

S1b. Is that your own place or someone else's place? By "own place," we mean that you pay to stay there, even if someone else owns the place.

Own place.....	01	→ (GO TO BOX 1)
Someone else's place.....	02	
Don't know.....	94	} (SKIP TO Q.S1d)
Refused.....	97	

Box 1

INTERVIEWER: IF R HAS HIS OWN PLACE WHICH IS AN APARTMENT, ROOM, OR HOUSE, SKIP TO BOX 3, CLASSIFY AS HOMED, AND READ TERMINATION PARAGRAPH.

S1c. Is that your parent's place, some other relative's place, a friend's place, or someone else's place?

Parent's.....	01
Other relative's.....	02
Friend's.....	03
Someone else's (SPECIFY):	04
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

S1d. How often do you use that place for sleeping? Would you say every day, almost every day, once or twice a week, or less than once a week?

Every day.....	01	
Almost every day.....	02	
Once or twice a week.....	03	
Less than once a week.....	04	
Don't know.....	94	} (SKIP TO Q.S2)
Refused.....	97	

S1e. Do you have an arrangement with your (parents/relatives/friends/someone else) to sleep in their place on a regular basis?

Yes.....	01	→ (GO TO BOX 2)
No.....	02	
Don't know.....	94	} (SKIP TO Q.S2)
Refused.....	97	

Box 2

INTERVIEWER: IF R'S HOME IS SOMEONE ELSE'S PLACE BUT R SLEEPS THERE EVERY DAY OR ALMOST EVERY DAY, AND THIS IS A REGULAR ARRANGEMENT, SKIP TO BOX 3, CLASSIFY AS HOMED, AND READ TERMINATION PARAGRAPH.

S2. Where do you usually sleep? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Shelter..... 01
Welfare or voucher hotel..... 02
Street, park, or other open space..... 03
Public place (bus stations, buses,
subway, all-night movies, airports,
bar, etc.)..... 04
Abandoned building..... 05
Car or truck..... 06
Some other place (SPECIFY): _____ .. 07
Don't know..... 94
Refused..... 97

Box 3

SCREENING OUTCOME FOR SHELTERS AND SOUP KITCHENS

CIRCLE APPROPRIATE NUMBER BELOW AND PROCEED ACCORDINGLY.

R IS HOMELESS -- Someone who has no place he considers home or
whose home is neither a room, an apartment,
nor a house; or whose room, apartment, or
house is not his own, and he either stays
there twice a week or less or has no arrange-
ment to sleep there regularly..... 01
R IS HOMED -- (READ TERMINATION PARAGRAPH BELOW)..... 02

ASK Q.S3 AND Q.S3A ONLY AT CONGREGATING SITES.

S3. Over the past seven days, since last (DAY OF INTERVIEW), have you spent
any night in a shelter?

Yes..... 01 + (GO TO BOX 4)
No..... 02
Don't know..... 94
Refused..... 97

S3a. Over the past seven days, since last (DAY OF INTERVIEW), have you eaten
any meals in a soup kitchen, shelter, or other place serving free
meals?

Yes..... 01
No..... 02
Don't know..... 94
Refused..... 97 } (GO TO BOX 4)

Box 4

SCREENING OUTCOME FOR CONGREGATING SITES:

CIRCLE APPROPRIATE NUMBER BELOW AND PROCEED ACCORDINGLY.

R IS ELIGIBLE - R is homeless and has not used a shelter
or meal service within the last seven
days..... 01

R IS INELIGIBLE - R is homeless but has used a shelter or
meal service within the last seven days..... 02

IF R IS HOMELESS OR ELIGIBLE FOR CONGREGATING SITE SAMPLE, READ THE FOLLOWING
PARAGRAPH:

(Now/In a few minutes) I'd like to ask you some more questions about
you, where you stay, and what you eat. The interview will take about
15 minutes and we will pay you \$5.00 for your time. All of your
answers will be kept strictly confidential.

IF R IS HOMED OR INELIGIBLE FOR CONGREGATING SITE SAMPLE, READ THE TERMINATION
PARAGRAPH BELOW AND COMPLETE QUESTIONS S4. - S7.

Those are all the questions I have for you. Thank you very much for

IF YOU ARE NOT CONTINUING TO THE _____ QUESTIONNAIRE, OR IF THIS IS A BREAK-OFF, COMPLETE THIS PAGE.

S4. GENDER

Male.....	01
Female.....	02
Don't know.....	94

S5. RACE

Black.....	01
White, not Hispanic.....	02
Hispanic.....	03
American Indian.....	04
Asian.....	05
Other (SPECIFY) _____	06
Don't know.....	94

S6. R'S APPROXIMATE AGE

UNDER 18.....	01
18-30.....	02
31-50.....	03
51-65.....	04
65+.....	05
Don't know.....	94

S7. DID R APPEAR TO BE... (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Drunk.....	01
Under the influence of drugs.....	02
Seriously ill.....	03
Confused.....	04
Incoherent.....	05
Dirty and unkempt.....	06
Shabbily dressed.....	07
Carrying packages with personal belongings.....	08
Lucid and alert.....	09
Other (SPECIFY) _____	10

FOR BREAKOFFS ONLY:

S8. INDICATE THE REASONS FOR THE BREAKOFF:

OMB No.: 05840360

Expires: 9/30/87

Interviewer: _____ ID No.: _____

PREPARED MEALS FOR THE HOMELESS PROJECT
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Sponsored By:

Food and Nutrition Service

Conducted By:

Urban Institute
Research Triangle Institute

Date of Interview: ____/____/____

Time Interview Started: : AM
PM

Survey Result Codes (Circle One)	
21	- Interview Complete
22	- Refusal
23	- Unable to Locate
24	- Breakoff
25	- Language Barrier
26	- Duplicate
27	- Other (SPECIFY) _____

The following questions ask for more information about you, where you stay, and what you eat. The interview will take about 15 minutes and we will pay you \$5.00 for your time. All of your answers will be kept strictly confidential.

SHELTER

1. How long have you lived in (CITY NAME)? (PROBE FOR CONTINUOUS RESIDENCY)

A week or less.....	01
One to three weeks.....	02
One to five months.....	03
Six months to eleven months.....	04
One to five years.....	05
Six to ten years.....	06
Eleven or more years.....	07
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

2. Where did you sleep or rest during the last 24 hours? (READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES AND CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Shelter (SPECIFY): ..	01
Street, park or other open place.....	02
Public place (buses, bus station, airport, all-night movie, subway, bar, etc.).....	03
Someone's room, apartment or house.....	04
An abandoned building.....	05
A car, van or truck.....	06
Some place else (SPECIFY): ..	07
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

3. Over the last seven days, that is, since last (DAY OF INTERVIEW), on how many days did you sleep or rest in the following places: (READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES)

DAYS PER WEEK

- | | |
|--|----------------------|
| a. In a shelter..... | <input type="text"/> |
| b. In a rented room..... | <input type="text"/> |
| c. On the streets, in a park..... | <input type="text"/> |
| d. In a bus, bus station, all-night movie, airport, subway, bar, or some other public place..... | <input type="text"/> |
| e. In a family member's or relative's home..... | <input type="text"/> |
| f. In someone else's home or apartment..... | <input type="text"/> |
| g. In an empty or abandoned building..... | <input type="text"/> |
| h. Elsewhere (SPECIFY): _____ | <input type="text"/> |
| i. TOTAL..... | <input type="text"/> |

4. When was the last time you had a home or other permanent place to stay? (PROBE FOR MONTH AND YEAR)

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
MONTH		YEAR	

5. Was that an apartment, a room, a house, or some other kind of place?

Apartment.....	01
Room.....	02
House.....	03
Some other kind of place (SPECIFY) _____	04
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

6. Did you live in that place by yourself or did you live there with other people?

Lived alone.....	01	} (SKIP TO Q.6b)
Lived with other people.....	02	
Don't know.....	94	
Refused.....	97	

6a. Who did you share that place with? Was it family or relatives, friends, or someone else? Specifically, was it with... (READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES AND CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Spouse.....	01
Children.....	02
Parents (Mother and/or Father).....	03
Sisters and/or brothers.....	04
Grandparents.....	05
Other relatives.....	06
Friends.....	07
Other persons (SPECIFY):	08
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

6b. Why did you leave that place? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Evicted.....	01
Asked to leave.....	02
Didn't get along with people there.....	03
Not a good location for me.....	04
Building condemned, destroyed, or urban renewal.....	05
Other (SPECIFY):	06
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

FOOD AND BEVERAGE INTAKE

7. In general, would you say the healthfulness of your diet is... (READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES)

Excellent.....	01
Very good.....	02
Good.....	03
Fair.....	04
Poor.....	05
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

8. Which of the following best describes your situation in terms of the food you eat? (READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES)

Get enough of the kinds of food you want to eat.....	01	} (SKIP TO Q.10)
Get enough but not always what you want to eat.....	02	
Sometimes not enough to eat.....	03	
Often not enough to eat.....	04	
Don't know.....	94	
Refused.....	97	

9. How often do you find that you do not have enough food to eat?

Every day.....	01	+ (SKIP TO Q.10)
Every other day.....	02	
Two times a week.....	03	
Once a week.....	04	
Several times a month.....	05	
Other (SPECIFY): ..	06	
Never.....	07	
Don't know.....	94	
Refused.....	97	

9a. Why do you not have enough food to eat? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Do not have a place to get food.....	01
Do not have a place to cook/store food.....	02
Do not have enough money to buy food.....	03
Can't get to places that serve food.....	04
Don't like the foods served.....	05
Can't chew the foods served.....	06
Other (SPECIFY): ..	07
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

10. How many times do you usually eat in a day?

Less than once per day.....	01
Once per day.....	02
Twice per day.....	03
Three times per day.....	04
Four times per day.....	05
Five times per day.....	06
More than five times per day.....	07
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

11. We are interested in how you get food and where you eat. During the past seven days, since last (DAY OF INTERVIEW), on how many days did you get food from each of the following places? (READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES).

DAYS PER WEEK

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| a. Soup kitchens..... | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Shelter where you live..... | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Food pantry..... | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Food wagon..... | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Friend's or relative's place..... | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Grocery store..... | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Restaurant where you pay..... | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h. Restaurant (back door, handouts)..... | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i. Trash cans..... | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| j. Feeding site for elderly..... | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| k. Other (SPECIFY): _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

ASK Q.12 ONLY OF PEOPLE AT MEAL SITES, INCLUDING SHELTERS THAT SERVE MEALS -
FOR ALL OTHERS, SKIP TO Q.13.-

12. How often do you come to this place for food?

Once a day.....	01
Twice a day.....	02
Three times a day.....	03
Every other day.....	04
Once a week.....	05
Once a month.....	06
Other (SPECIFY): ..	07
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

12a. Where else do you go for food? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Soup kitchens.....	01
Shelter where I live.....	02
Food pantry.....	03
Food wagon.....	04
Friend's or relative's place.....	05
Grocery store.....	06
Restaurant where I pay.....	07
Restaurant (back door, handouts).....	08
Trash cans.....	09
Congregate feeding site for elderly.....	10
Other (SPECIFY): ..	11
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

13. Where will you get food for your next meal?

Soup kitchens.....	01
Shelter where I live.....	02
Food pantry.....	03
Food wagon.....	04
Friend's or relative's place.....	05
Grocery store.....	06
Restaurant where I pay.....	07
Restaurant (back door, handouts).....	08
Trash cans.....	09
Congregate feeding site for elderly.....	10
Other (SPECIFY): ..	11
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

14. In the last seven days, since last (DAY OF INTERVIEW), did you go a whole
day without anything to eat?

Yes.....	01	
No.....	02	
Don't know.....	94	} (SKIP TO Q.15)
Refused.....	97	

14a. How many days last week did you go without anything to eat?

Number of days.....

Don't know..... 94
Refused..... 97

14b. Why did you go without anything to eat for (NUMBER OF DAYS)?
(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Forgot to eat..... 01
Not hungry/don't feel like eating..... 02
Fasting one time a week..... 03
Was sick or not feeling well..... 04
Didn't have any money..... 05
Spent money on other things..... 06
Had no place to get food..... 07
Had no way to get to place with food..... 08
Missed meal time..... 09
Other (SPECIFY): 10
..... 10
Don't know..... 94
Refused..... 97

15. Do you ever go without anything to eat for two or more days at a time?

Yes..... 01
No..... 02
Don't know..... 94 } (SKIP TO Q.16)
Refused..... 97

15a. How often?

A few times a year..... 01
Once a month..... 02
Twice a month..... 03
Once a week..... 04
Two days a week..... 05
More than two days a week..... 06
Other (SPECIFY): 07
Don't know..... 94
Refused..... 97

15b. Why do you go without anything to eat for two or more days?
(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Forgot to eat.....	01
Not hungry/don't feel like eating.....	02
Fasting one time a week.....	03
Was sick or not feeling well.....	04
Didn't have any money.....	05
Spent money on other things.....	06
Had no place to get food.....	07
Had no way to get to place with food.....	08
Missed meal time.....	09
Other (SPECIFY): _____	
_____	.. 10
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

16. Now, I would like you to describe everything you ate and drank yesterday. Please tell me everything you ate and drank from the time you got up in the morning to the time you went to sleep last night. I am interested in what you ate and drank at meals, as well as snacks, other foods, or drinks you had between meals.

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS:

FILL IN THE ONE-DAY FOOD LIST ON THE NEXT PAGE. ASK QUESTIONS AND PROBES IN THE FOLLOWING ORDER: 1. SPONTANEOUS RECALL; 2. PROBES FOR ADDITIONAL ITEMS; 3. DESCRIPTIONS OF MIXED FOOD ITEMS SUCH AS CASSEROLES OR SANDWICHES; 4. NUMBER OF PORTIONS, OR SIZE IF PORTION IS UNUSUALLY LARGE OR SMALL.

1. SPONTANEOUS RECALL

ASK Q.16 AS WRITTEN ABOVE. THIS QUESTION ASKS FOR A SPONTANEOUS RECALL OF ALL FOOD ITEMS EATEN OR DRUNK YESTERDAY, FROM 12 MIDNIGHT TO THE NEXT 12 MIDNIGHT (ALTHOUGH YOU WILL ASK THE QUESTION AS "FROM WHEN YOU GOT UP TO WHEN YOU WENT TO SLEEP.")

IN THE COLUMN MARKED "FOOD ITEM," WRITE DOWN ALL THE FOODS AND DRINKS THAT THE INDIVIDUAL RECALLS. GIVE THE PERSON TIME TO THINK. TRY NOT TO INTERRUPT THE PERSON WHEN THEY ARE TRYING TO RECALL FOODS OR DRINKS.

IT MAY HELP THE PERSON TO RECALL FOODS EATEN BY TIME OF DAY. Q.16 HAS BEEN LAID OUT TO ENABLE YOU TO WRITE DOWN FOODS BY WHEN THEY WERE CONSUMED. YOU CAN ALSO USE TIME OF DAY AS A PROBE (E.G., "DID YOU HAVE ANYTHING TO EAT OR DRINK BEFORE YOU WENT TO BED?")

2. PROBES FOR ADDITIONAL ITEMS

AFTER THE PERSON TELLS YOU EVERYTHING HE/SHE REMEMBERS CONSUMING, THEN GO BACK AND PROBE FOR ADDITIONAL ITEMS. USE THE LIST OF FOODS ON P. 10 TO PROBE. USE THE HANDOUT PICTURES OF FOODS, AS NECESSARY.

FIND OUT WHETHER OTHER FOODS SUCH AS SPREADS (BUTTER, MARGARINE, GRAVY, JELLY), BEVERAGES, FRUITS, SNACK ITEMS (SUCH AS CANDY, CHIPS, COOKIES) FOR MEALS, ASK IF THEY HAD SOUPS, SALADS, OR DESSERTS.

WRITE ANY ADDITIONAL ITEMS ELICITED BY THESE PROBES IN THE "FOOD ITEM" COLUMN, PUTTING SUCH ITEMS IN THE SPACE CORRESPONDING TO THE TIME OF DAY EATEN.

3. DESCRIPTIONS OF MIXED FOOD ITEMS

FOR EVERY MIXED FOOD ITEM, SUCH AS A SANDWICH, CASSEROLE, STEW, SOUP, SALAD, ETC., ASK WHAT TYPES OF FOODS IT CONTAINED. WRITE ALL DESCRIPTORS OF SEPARATE FOOD COMPONENTS (E.G., BREAD, PEANUT BUTTER, JELLY, MACARONI, CHEESE, HAM) IN THE "DESCRIPTION" COLUMN.

4. NUMBER OF PORTIONS OR PORTION SIZE

ESTIMATE THE AMOUNT OF FOOD EATEN, SUCH AS THE NUMBER OF SERVINGS. IF POSSIBLE, TRY TO DETERMINE GENERAL SIZE OF SERVING SUCH AS ONE, TWO, OR THREE SLICES/SERVINGS; A SIP, A SMALL GLASS, OR A WHOLE CAN OF CARBONATED DRINKS; ONE OR TWO PIECES OF FRUIT, ETC.

WRITE NUMBER OF PORTIONS, OR PORTION SIZE, IN THE "PORTION" COLUMN.

USE AS PROBES FOR QUESTION 16, ADDITIONAL FOODS

BREAD AND CEREALS

Breads, rolls, crackers
Cereal, cooked or ready-to-eat
Noodles, macaroni, rice
Pancakes, waffles, sweet breads

FRUITS

Juice: grape, orange, tomato
Citrus fruits: oranges, grapefruit
Non-citrus fruits: apples, pear, banana
Dried fruits: raisins, prunes

VEGETABLES

Starchy vegetables: potatoes, peas, corn
Dark-green vegetables: spinach, broccoli, greens
Soups: vegetable
Dark-yellow vegetables: carrots, squash
Other vegetables: beans, celery

MEATS

Red meats: hamburger, sandwich meat, hot dogs
Chicken
Fish: tuna, sardines, fried fish sandwich
Eggs and egg dishes
Peanut butter
Dried peas and beans
Mixed meat dishes: chili, tacos, spaghetti

MILK

Milk
Cheese
Yogurt
Ice cream/pudding/ice milk
Mixed cheese dish: pizza, macaroni/cheese

OTHER

Wine, beer, whiskey
Chips, pretzels, popcorn
Sweets: doughnut, sweet roll, cake, pie, candy
Carbonated drink, fruit punch, tea, coffee
Fats and oils: margarine, butter, salad dressing, gravy

ONE-DAY FOOD AND BEVERAGE LIST

FOOD ITEM	DESCRIPTION	PORTION/SIZE
MORNING		
MIDMORNING		
NOON		
AFTERNOON		
EVENING		
BEFORE BED		
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES		

16a. Would you say that this is typical of what you usually eat and drink?

Yes.....	01	→ (SKIP TO Q.17)
No.....	02	
Don't know.....	94	
Refused.....	97	

16b. How and why was what you ate and drank yesterday different from what you usually eat and drink?

More than I usually eat.....	01
Less than I usually eat.....	02
Other (SPECIFY): _____	03
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

17. In the past month, did you pay for any food or meal?

Yes.....	01	
No.....	02	
Don't know.....	94	} (SKIP TO Q.18)
Refused.....	97	

17a. How did you pay? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Cash.....	01
Food stamps.....	02
Work at feeding site.....	03
Trade something.....	04
Other (SPECIFY): _____	05
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

18. In the past month, did you pay for anything you drank?

Yes.....	01	
No.....	02	
Don't know.....	94	} (SKIP TO Q.19)
Refused.....	97	

18a. How did you pay? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Cash.....	01
Food stamps.....	02
Work at feeding site.....	03
Trade something.....	04
Other (SPECIFY): _____	05
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

WORK INCOME, SUPPORT

19. Are you working now at a steady job, that is, a job for pay that has lasted for more than three months?

Yes..... 01 → (SKIP TO Q.22)
No..... 02
Don't know..... 94
Refused..... 97

20. Have you worked at all for pay at any time over the last 30 days?

Yes..... 01
No..... 02
Don't know..... 94
Refused..... 97

20a. Have you looked for a job at any time during the last 30 days?

Yes..... 01
No..... 02
Don't know..... 94
Refused..... 97

21. Think back to the last time you held a steady job (that is, a job for pay that lasted for more than three months). Can you tell me when you finished or left that job? (PROBE FOR MONTH AND YEAR)

MONTH		YEAR	

Never held a steady job..... 99
Don't know..... 94
Refused..... 97

22. What is the last grade of school you completed?

Did not finish elementary school (0-7)..... 01
Did not graduate from high school (8-11)..... 02
High school graduate or GED (12)..... 03
Some college or post high school..... 04
College graduate..... 05
College graduate plus post graduate
or professional training..... 06
Don't know..... 94
Refused..... 97

23. Over the last 30 days, have you received any cash, checks, or money orders from...

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DON'T KNOW</u>	<u>REFUSED</u>
a. Your relatives or family?.....	01	02	94	97
b. Your friends?.....	01	02	94	97
c. AFDC or ADC?.....	01	02	94	97
d. General assistance?.....	01	02	94	97
e. Unemployment insurance?.....	01	02	94	97
f. SSI (not including old age pension)?....	01	02	94	97
g. Social Security or other old age pension or veterans benefits?.....	01	02	94	97
h. Disability payments or workmen's compensation?.....	01	02	94	97
i. Working at a job like in a factory or selling newspapers or other things?..	01	02	94	97
j. Trading or swapping things with other people?.....	01	02	94	97
k. Gifts?.....	01	02	94	97
l. Handouts?.....	01	02	94	97
m. Selling blood or plasma?.....	01	02	94	97
n. Some other source?.....	01	02	94	97

(SPECIFY): _____

24. In the last 30 days, approximately how much money did you get from all of the sources we just talked about, including work for pay, General Assistance, and AFDC?

\$

--	--	--	--

Don't know..... 94
Refused..... 97

24a. Do you have cash or savings worth more than \$2,000?

Yes..... 01
No..... 02
Don't know..... 94
Refused..... 97

FOOD STAMPS

25. Do you have a mailing address, or other arrangement, where you could receive food stamps by mail?

Yes..... 01
No..... 02
Don't know..... 94
Refused..... 97

25a. Do you receive food stamps now?

Yes.....	01	
No.....	02	
Don't know.....	94	} (SKIP TO Q.27)
Refused.....	97	

25b. How much do you get each month?

\$

--	--	--

25c. How long have you been getting food stamps? (PROBE FOR NUMBER OF MONTHS)?

--	--	--

MONTHS

26. How do you use your food stamps? (READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES AND CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Buy food from grocery stores.....	01	} (SKIP TO Q.29)
Buy food from restaurants.....	02	
The stamps go directly to the program where I live.....	03	
Sell them for cash.....	04	
They get stolen or lost.....	05	
Other (SPECIFY): _____	06	
Don't know.....	94	
Refused.....	97	

27. Have you ever received food stamps?

Yes.....	01	→ (SKIP TO Q.28)
No.....	02	
Don't know.....	94	
Refused.....	97	

27a. Have you ever applied for food stamps?

Yes.....	01	
No.....	02	→ (SKIP TO Q.27c)
Don't know.....	94	} (SKIP TO Q.29)
Refused.....	97	

27b. When you applied for food stamps the last time, what happened?

Turned down.....	01	} (SKIP TO Q.27d)
Received payments.....	02	
Application pending.....	03	
Withdrew application.....	04	
Other (SPECIFY): ..	05	
Don't know.....	94	} (SKIP TO Q.29)
Refused.....	97	

27c. Can you tell me any reasons why you have never applied for food stamps? (READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES AND CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Didn't know about them.....	01	} (SKIP TO Q.29)
Knew about them but didn't think		
was eligible.....	02	
Didn't know how/where to apply.....	03	
Too much trouble, don't like		
offices/paperwork.....	04	
Didn't have any way to cook food.....	05	
Didn't have a mailing address where		
You could get food stamps.....	06	
Other (SPECIFY): ..	07	}
Don't know.....	94	
Refused.....	97	

27d. Why were you turned down?

_____		} (SKIP TO Q.29)

Don't know.....	94	
Refused.....	97	

28. When you did have food stamps, how did you use them? (READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES AND CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Bought food from grocery store.....	01
Buy food from restaurants.....	02
The stamps went directly to the	
program where I lived.....	03
Sold them for cash.....	04
They got stolen or lost.....	05
Other (SPECIFY): ..	06
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

29. If you have food that needs to be cooked before you can eat it, do you have a place where you can go to cook that food?

Yes..... 01
No..... 02
Don't know..... 94
Refused..... 97

29a. Suppose that you could use food stamps to get prepared meals at a soup kitchen or shelter. Would you want to use food stamps that way?

Yes..... 01
No..... 02 → (SKIP TO Q.29c)
Don't know..... 94
Refused..... 97

29b. If you went to a soup kitchen or shelter and they said you could get the meal free or you could give some food stamps for the meal, would you give them food stamps?

Yes..... 01 → (SKIP TO Q.30)
No..... 02
Don't know..... 94 (SKIP TO Q.30)
Refused..... 97

29c. Why not? (IN RESPONSE TO A "NO" ON EITHER Q.29a OR Q.29b)

RESPONDENT HISTORY AND DEMOGRAPHICS

30. I am going to read to you a list of experiences some people may have had. For each one, tell me whether you have ever had that experience.

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DON'T</u> <u>KNOW</u>	<u>REFUSED</u>
a. Been in the military, including the reserve?.....	01	02	94	97
b. (IF YES) Did you serve in Vietnam?.....	01	02	94	97
c. Been a patient in a detoxification (detox) or treatment center for alcohol or drug abuse?.....	01	02	94	97
d. Served time in a state or federal prison?.....	01	02	94	97
e. Been in a city or county jail for more than three or four days?.....	01	02	94	97
f. Been admitted to a mental hospital so that you stayed overnight?.....	01	02	94	97

31. What is your present marital status? Are you... (READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES)

Married and neither divorced nor separated.....	01
Divorced or separated.....	02
Widowed.....	03
Single and never married.....	04
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

32. In the last year, have you ever seen a doctor or visited a clinic or hospital emergency room?

Yes.....	01
No.....	02
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

32a. In the last year, has a doctor or other medical person given you medicine or treated you for a disease or health condition?

Yes.....	01
No.....	02
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

32b. Do you have any of the following medical conditions? (READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES AND CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Sugar in your blood (diabetes).....	01
Anemia (poor blood).....	02
High blood pressure.....	03
Heart disease/stroke.....	04
Problems with your liver.....	05
Arthritis, rheumatism, joint problems...	06
Chest infection, cold, cough,	
bronchitis.....	07
Pneumonia.....	08
Tuberculosis (TB) (spitting up blood)...	09
Cancer.....	10
Problem walking, lost limb, other	
handicap.....	11
Other (SPECIFY): _____ ..	12
None.....	13
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

33. Would you say your health, in general, now is excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor?

Excellent.....	01
Very good.....	02
Good.....	03
Fair.....	04
Poor.....	05
Don't know.....	94
Refused.....	97

34. Now, I am going to ask some questions about how you felt over the last week. Tell me whether you never felt that way last week, felt that way some of the time last week, or felt that way most of the time last week.

- | | <u>NEVER</u> | <u>SOME</u>
<u>OF THE</u>
<u>TIME</u> | <u>MOST</u>
<u>OF THE</u>
<u>TIME</u> | <u>DON'T</u>
<u>KNOW</u> | <u>REFUSED</u> |
|---|--------------|---|---|-----------------------------|----------------|
| a. Was your appetite so poor that you did not feel like eating?..... | 01 | ... 02 | ... 03 | ... 94 | 97 |
| b. Did you feel so tired and worn out that you could not enjoy anything?..... | 01 | ... 02 | ... 03 | ... 94 | 97 |
| c. Did you feel depressed?..... | 01 | ... 02 | ... 03 | ... 94 | 97 |
| d. Did you feel unhappy about the way your life is going?... | 01 | ... 02 | ... 03 | ... 94 | 97 |
| e. Did you feel discouraged and worried about your future?..... | 01 | ... 02 | ... 03 | ... 94 | 97 |
| f. Did you feel lonely?..... | 01 | ... 02 | ... 03 | ... 94 | 97 |

35. Was there ever a time in your life when you felt so bad that you tried to kill yourself, that is, tried to commit suicide?

Yes..... 01
 No..... 02
 Don't know..... 94
 Refused..... 97

36. How old are you?

--	--

36a. What is your date of birth? (PROBE FOR MONTH, DAY, AND YEAR)

--	--

MONTH

--	--

DAY

--	--

YEAR

37. Are you by yourself or do you have some family (husband/wife, children, or some other relatives) or friends who are also homeless with you? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

R is by her/himself..... 01
Children: How many (SPECIFY): 02
Spouse..... 03
Other relative (SPECIFY): 04
Nonfamily (SPECIFY): 05
Don't know..... 94
Refused..... 97

TERMINATION PARAGRAPH: Those are all the questions I have for you. Thank you very much for your time. Let me assure you again that all the information you have given will be kept strictly confidential. If you will sign this receipt, I can give you the \$5.00 we agreed on. Thanks.

TIME
FINISHED

--	--

 :

--	--

 AM
PM

INTERVIEWER OBSERVATIONS
(TO BE CIRCLED FOR ALL INTERVIEWS INCLUDING BREAKOFFS, REFUSALS, AND
- UNABLE TO LOCATES)

38. Gender

Male.....	01
Female.....	02
Don't know.....	94

39. Race

Black.....	01
White, not Hispanic.....	02
Hispanic.....	03
American Indian.....	04
Asian.....	05
Other (SPECIFY): ..	06
Don't know.....	94

40. Did R appear to be... (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Drunk.....	01
Under the influence of drugs.....	02
Physically ill.....	03
Confused.....	04
Incoherent.....	05
Dirty and unwashed.....	06
Shabbily dressed.....	07
Carrying packages with personal belongings.....	08
Lucid and alert.....	09
Other (SPECIFY): ..	10

41. R's location when contacted for interview: (CIRCLE ONE)

Shelter not serving meals.....	01
Shelter with meal service.....	02
Meal provider (no shelter).....	03
Sidewalk, street, or alley.....	04
Park.....	05
In public access building (e.g., bus or train station, lobby of apartment, bar, theatre, etc.).....	06
Parking lot.....	07
Other (SPECIFY): ..	08

..... .. 08

42. How many children were physically present with R?

--	--

43. Was a spouse (partner) physically present with R?

Yes.....	01
No.....	02
Don't know.....	94

44. Interviewer comments:

FOR BREAKOFFS ONLY:

45. Indicate the reasons for the breakoff:

46. Estimate R's approximate age:

Under 18.....	01
18-30.....	02
31-50.....	03
51-65.....	04
65+.....	05
Don't know.....	94

LOCAL FOOD STAMP OFFICE DATA COLLECTION PROTOCOL

City _____

Date _____

Local Food Stamp Office _____ Interviewer _____

Address _____

Phone _____

Person interviewed (name and position) _____

Time started: : am/pm

CERTIFICATION

We are interested in the procedures your office follows in getting food stamps to homeless persons.

1. What are your procedures for determining eligibility for homeless food stamp applicants?

[illegible]

1c. If identity is a problem, how do you establish the individual's identity?

[illegible]

1b. What other documentation or information do you require the applicant to supply (in addition to documentation of identity)?

1c. Do you give expedited service to homeless applicants? _____

1c.1. If YES, in what percentage of cases? _____

1d. Are the procedures you've just described different from procedures you use for regular food stamp applicants (non-homeless)?

Yes 1
No 2

1d.1 IF YES, how? _____

1e. Have you changed any certification procedures relevant to homeless applicants during the last year?

Yes 1
No 2

1e.1 IF YES, what have you changed, and why? _____

2. If you have had any problems with eligibility determination procedures for homeless persons, could you describe them:

3. What are the most common reasons for not being able to certify homeless persons to receive food stamps?

ISSUANCE

4. How do you issue food stamps to homeless persons? (PROBE for any regular--e.g., monthly--reporting requirements as part of the issuance procedure)

5. Have you changed any issuance procedures relevant to homeless applicants during the last year?

Yes	1
No	2

5a. IF YES, what have you changed, and why? _____

6. Please describe any problems your office has had with actually getting food stamps to homeless persons:

6a. How often do such difficulties occur, that is, in about what percent of homeless cases?

DATA ON HOMELESS FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS

7. Can you tell me how many homeless people were certified to receive food stamps during the last month? (this means a count of ALL homeless people receiving fs last month, NOT just new actions)

7a. If you do not have these figures now, could you get them? Is the information computerized, or identified in the case file, or is there any other information that would allow you to retrieve these numbers? Please describe any method that would produce these figures.

If your office cannot produce these figures, why not?

8. Can you tell me what the dollar value of food stamps issued to homeless persons was during the last month?

8a. If you do not have these figures now, could you get them? Is the information computerized, or identified in the case file, or is there any other information that would allow you to retrieve these numbers? Please describe any method that would produce these figures.

If your office cannot produce these figures, why not?

OTHER PROCEDURES

9. Do you do anything to inform homeless people of their eligibility for food stamps?

Yes	1	What?	_____
No	2		_____

10. Have you established contacts with shelters, meal sites and other providers serving the homeless to let them know about eligibility?

Yes	1	Please describe.	_____
No	2		_____

11. Do you have any suggestions for improving food stamp certification and issuance procedures for homeless persons?

12. Will you send me copies of any special forms or procedures your office uses for eligibility, approval, accountability, or reporting with respect to certifying homeless persons for food stamps?

That's about the end of my questions. Is there anything I've missed, or anything else you would like to add?

Thank you for your time.

Time finished: ____ : ____ am/pm

SECTION D

LIST OF PROVIDERS AUTHORIZED TO ACCEPT FOOD STAMPS
UNDER THE PREPARED MEALS PROVISION,
IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER BY STATE AND CITY
AS OF MARCH 31, 1988

LIST OF PROVIDERS AUTHORIZED TO ACCEPT FOOD STAMPS
UNDER THE PREPARED MEALS PROVISION,
IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER BY STATE AND CITY
AS OF MARCH 31, 1988

<u>PROVIDER</u>	<u>TOWN</u>	<u>ST</u>
OUR LADY OF GUADALUPE SHELTER	COLEXICO	CA
HOUSE OF HOPE	EL CENTRO	CA
SALVATION ARMY HOSPITALITY HOUSE	EL CENTRO	CA
GOOD SHEPHERD CTR FOR HOMELESS WOMEN	LOS ANGELES	CA
VALLEY SHELTER	N HOLLYWOOD	CA
MARY BAKER MISSION CENTER	PORTERVILLE	CA
LA PUENTE HOME, INC.	ALAMOSA	CO
RED CROSS EMERGENCY TEMPORARY SHELTER	COLORADO SPRINGS	CO
CAPITOL HILL COMMUNITY SERVICES	DENVER	CO
LIGHTHOUSE GOSPEL MINISTRIES RESCUE MISSION	GRAND JUNCTION	CO
SALVATION ARMY EMERGENCY SHELTER	BELLEVILLE	IL
HOME SWEET HOME MISSION	BLOOMINGTON	IL
GOOD SAMARITAN HOUSE	CARBONDALE	IL
POLISH WELFARE ASS'N TURNING POINT SHELTER	CHICAGO	IL
ANNA BIXBY WOMEN'S CENTER	HARRISBURG	IL
CLARK STREET HOUSE OF MERCY	DES MOINES	IO
DOOR OF FAITH MISSION	DES MOINES	IO
SALVATION ARMY	MONROE	LA
SHREVEPORT-BOSSIER RESC. MISSION & FAM CTR	SHREVEPORT	LA
HOSPITALITY HOUSE	ASHEVILLE	NC
GRAND FORKS MISSION	GRAND FORKS	ND
SALVATION ARMY	BINGHAMPTON	NY
BETHESDA MISSION	HARRISBURG	PA
SALVATION ARMY FAMILY SERVICE CENTER	LANCASTER	PA
CHILDREN OF LIGHT MISSION	PHILADELPHIA	PA
MID-CITY YMCA	PHILADELPHIA	PA
SISTERS OF THE ROAD CAFE	PORTLAND	OR
FAMILY SHELTER	COLUMBIA	SC
PROVIDENCE HOME WOMEN'S SHELTER	COLUMBUS	SC
KENT C. WITHERS FAMILY CRISIS CTR	KNOXVILLE	TN
SALVATION ARMY	KNOXVILLE	TN
TRAVELER'S REST MISSION	KNOXVILLE	TN
MINISTERIAL ASS'N TEMPORARY SHELTER	MORRISTOWN	TN

COVENANT HOUSE	HOUSTON	TX
OPEN DOOR MISSION	HOUSTON	TX
SALVATION ARMY FAMILY RESIDENCE	HOUSTON	TX
THE BRIDGE SHELTER	PASADENA	TX
HOPE HOUSE	FREDERICKSBURG	VA
TELLURIAN COMMUNITY	MADISON	WI
GOOD SAMARITAN MISSION	JACKSON	WY

AUTHORIZED PROVIDERS NOT COVERED IN REPORT

<u>ID</u>	<u>PROVIDER</u>	<u>TOWN</u>	<u>ST</u>
1	METROPOLITAN INTERFAITH ASSOCIATION	MEMPHIS	TN
3	SALVATION ARMY HOSPITALITY HOUSE	SAN JOSE	CA
18	SAN JOSE RESCUE MISSION	SAN JOSE	CA
41	PROJECT OPEN HAND	SAN FRANCISCO	CA

Reasons for not including or including providers in the report:

- #01 This program does not serve the homeless. It delivers meals to the homebound elderly and also serves meals to the elderly at a congregate site. Payment is by donation. The homebound receive a weekly envelope for anonymous contributions. Occasionally, they will pay with food stamps (a few dollars here and there), but usually only when their cash has run out. At the congregate meal site there is a donation box. Donations are usually in coinage and no food stamps have ever been received at that site. Both types of clients are told that they may give food stamps. They say that they have been authorized since 1981.
- #03 Neither director (who is new) nor program coordinator knew that they were authorized. Former director could not be reached. Clearly provisions have not been implemented, but we do not know why not. Note that they had not been implemented in November 1987 when we spoke with former director (apparently, they were authorized in September, 1987).
- #18 They say that they accept food stamps only from residents in drug and alcohol rehabilitation program and that they are not authorized to accept food stamps from the homeless.
- #41 This is a home delivered meal program for AIDS patients and their families. They do not use the provisions and never asked to be authorized. Application was apparently made on their behalf by the local health department.

NOTE:

- #19 Original set of interviews did not include a #19.
- #44 Harbor Homeless Meal Provider (Panorama City, California) was originally listed as authorized, later this was changed to "application pending" because of some confusion about its status.
- #04 The Red Cross Temporary Emergency Shelter in Colorado Springs. This provider withdrew from the program on 3/31/88. However, we did not learn about this until after the second interview was conducted on 4/12/88. We have included this provider in the report as in many ways it is typical of others where the provisions are not working.

SECTION E

METHODS FOR COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS OF FOOD GROUP AND NUTRIENT DATA

METHODS FOR COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS OF FOOD GROUP AND NUTRIENT DATA

PROVIDER MEALS

The assessment of the nutrient quality of the meals served to the homeless at shelters and soup kitchens was based on systematic observations of breakfasts, lunches and dinners served by 310 providers (167 shelters and 143 soup kitchens). Interviewers were trained in meal observation to accurately describe the various components of a meal as served and to accurately estimate the size of portions being served. Observations did not include what foods homeless individuals actually ate at these meals or plate waste, due both to time and cost constraints of the research. Thus, observations reflect the food available to the homeless and not the intake of homeless individuals at these meals.

Interviewers scheduled their own interviews and meal observations based upon time availability and cooperation of providers. As a result the distribution of meals at which interviewers did observations was 15 percent breakfasts, 44 percent midday meals, and 41 percent evening meals. This compares to a distribution of all meals served that is approximately 29 percent breakfasts, 32 percent midday meals and 39 percent evening meals. Thus breakfasts are somewhat underrepresented and midday and evening meals are somewhat overrepresented. This sampling pattern results in an upward bias in estimates of food group and nutrient content of the average provider meal, since the average breakfast is somewhat lower on the number of core food groups represented, calories and protein than the other two meals, on average. On the other hand, the average provider breakfast does provide more of certain nutrients than the other two meals; therefore any bias is likely to be small.

Assessing Provider Meal Content

Training: All interviewers were trained in Food Portion Analysis (FPA) by a nutritionist. Synthetic food models, paper models, and a variety of meals using food samples were in this training. Interviewers were taught to identify specific foods precisely, describe the preparation method and estimate the quantities of each food served. A post-test after training demonstrated that interviewers were able to successfully perform the above tasks with a 90% confidence level.

Measuring Number of Servings: The training included methods for determining the number of servings offered of each food item. For foods served in easily identifiable units this was simple, as when one slice of bread was offered. Since two slices of bread comprise one serving, observers recorded 1/2 serving of bread if only one slice was offered.

For food items that could be measured in inches, such as a pork chop, observers compared an average pork chop served by a provider to a 6-inch ruler that they carried for this purpose. The three dimensions of the food were recorded on the observation form, and the nutritionist conducting the analysis used a computer program, NUTRITIONIST III, to convert these measurements into numbers of servings (see below, "Coding of Meals" and "Tally of Variety and Amount of Foods").

For other food items such as salads, casseroles and mashed potatoes, observers carried a set of measuring cups ranging from 1 cup down to 1/8 cup. Observers compared the amount of each food item placed on each plate to the measuring cups, estimating how many cups were being served. The volume of food was recorded, and the nutritionist conducting the analysis used the NUTRITION-IST III computer program to convert these measurements into numbers of servings (see below, "Coding of Meals" and "Tally of Variety and Amount of Foods").

In addition, training for observers included becoming familiar with the volume held by an array of standard serving containers (glasses, bowls, cups, plastic boxes). Portion size could easily be estimated when foods were served in containers, which was usually the case for at least some food items at each meal.

Data Collection: Each interviewer recorded the data collected at a meal observation on a Food Portion Analysis Form (see Appendix B). These data included a description, visual estimate of size, and the number of portions served of each food item included in the provider meal (see above paragraphs for method). To avoid the disruption of food service, the interviewers did not handle any food item. Instead, an interviewer stood to the side of the serving area and watched the serving process, estimating the size and number of servings as described above. On the FPA form, interviewers commented on the method of food service, gave a description of the food item, and recorded the frequency with which different foods were chosen.

Types of Food Service: The meals served by shelters and soup kitchens varied in style from everyone getting the same amounts of all the items on a set menu to smorgasbords with two or more alternative meats, vegetables, fruits and/or mixed dishes. Often, a choice of beverages was offered including fruit punch, coffee, tea and sometimes milk. A variety of breads or sweetened baked goods (muffins, sweet rolls, doughnuts, etc.) was sometimes placed on tables along with peanut butter, jelly and butter.

Selection of Meals: When providers offered options that resulted in different clients choosing substantially different combinations, interviewers had to record each different meal combination on a separate FPA form. They also noted the frequency with which each different combination occurred. The interviewer selected "typical" meals to describe. For this study, "typical" meals were defined as each different combination of food items that was served in roughly uniform quantities to a substantial number of people (more than 10% of participants) during a specified time period. At a buffet breakfast, for example, half the people might have cereal with milk, toast with butter and juice; one-fourth might have two slices of toast with peanut butter and jam and a piece of fruit; and one fourth might just have coffee.

Nutrient Assessment

Selection of Nutrients: The food and beverages recorded on the FPA forms were analyzed for calories and the following 13 nutrients:

- | | |
|---------------------|-----------------|
| 1) Protein | 8) Vitamin B-6 |
| 2) Carbohydrate | 9) Vitamin A |
| 3) Fat | 10) Iron |
| 4) Vitamin C | 11) Magnesium |
| 5) Thiamin | 12) Calcium |
| 6) Riboflavin | 13) Phosphorous |
| 7) Preformed Niacin | |

These nutrients are the same as those analyzed in the USDA evaluations of the child nutrition programs and the summer food service program, as well as in the 1977-78 Nationwide Food Consumption Survey.

The energy and nutrient content of the foods recorded on each FPA form were analyzed using the computerized nutrient analysis program Nutritionist III (1985). This program contains 1800 food items and uses primarily the revised series of USDA Handbook #8, Food Composition Tables, Bowes and Church's Food Values of Portions Commonly Used (14th Edition) (1985), and manufacturer's data.

Additional foods and recipes were added to the Nutritionist III (1985), data base, to reflect additional food items that appeared on the FPA forms. The revised editions of the USDA Handbook #8 supplied some of the food composition data for added foods. Nutritionists with USDA's Human Nutrition Information Service also provided composition data and recipes for most foods not listed in the USDA Handbook. Other recipes were obtained from Food for Fifty (1971), a cookbook for institutional cooking.

Analysis of Food Variety

Selection of Food Groups: The analysis was based on 10 food groups:

- | <u>Core</u> | <u>Additional</u> |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| 1) Milk and Milk Products | 6) Fats and Oils |
| 2) Fruits and Fruit Juices | 7) Baked Goods |
| 3) Vegetables | 8) Sweets |
| 4) Grain Products | 9) Sweetened Beverages |
| 5) Meat and Meat Alternates | 10) Salty Snacks |

Exhibit E-1 presents a more detailed list of foods and beverages included in each of the above food groups.

Coding of Meals: The interviewer's notes about the quantity and frequency of food items served were used to establish coding rules and to develop a nutrient profile per site, which was a composite when several different meals were served at that site. Coders usually used USDA's coding rules for added fat, sugar and unspecified amounts served. Posner and Morgan's manual, The Use of the 2D Food Portion Visual (1982), provided information on the conversion of two or three dimensional visual measurements to dry weights.

Tally of the Variety and Amounts of Food: The descriptions and amounts of each food item recorded on the FPA form were used to determine the variety and number of servings of food groups supplied by provider meals. During the pilot test, the portion sizes offered by providers varied greatly and they were generally larger than standard serving sizes. Therefore, determinations of the number of servings were based on the actual number of standard portions of a particular food served instead of on the mere presence of that food item. In general, the portion sizes reflected serving sizes recommended in Home and Garden Bulletin #232-1, 1986, except for grain products and a few other items. Based on pilot test observations, larger portions (e.g., two slices of bread and 3/4 to one cup of noodles or rice) were established for grain products.

The coder first identified the food group that corresponded to the recorded food item, such as choosing milk and milk products when cheese was listed on the FPA form. To tally the number of servings, the amount of a food item recorded on the form was compared to pre-established portion sizes for various foods in each of the 10 food groups. If the amount served was double the established portion size, two servings were tallied. For mixed dishes, coders assigned them to two or more food groups and tallied the number of servings for each of the major food components. For example, 1-1/2 cup lasagna counted as 1 grain product and 1 meat, whereas 1-1/2 cup chunky meat soup counted as 1 vegetable and 1 meat.

INDIVIDUALS' DIETARY INTAKE

Information on the food intake of homeless individuals was collected by those interviewers assigned to collect data from the homeless population. Interviewers were trained to use a one day food listing procedure as part of their field work training. All homeless individuals selected to be part of the survey were asked information about their food intake. This includes both the service-using homeless in our representative random sample and the non-representative sample of homeless individuals interviewed at congregating sites. The information collected does not reflect the times of day at which different foods were eaten but does indicate the foods the respondent could remember eating during the preceding one day period.

One Day Food Listing

Pilot interviews used a one day food listing procedure to collect food intake data. These pilots showed that homeless individuals had the capability to recall what they ate and drank the day prior to the interview. However, our procedures differ quite a bit from the detailed procedures used in interviews such as the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), in that it is much less detailed. Our interview lasted an average of 15 minutes, of which approximately half (7-8 minutes) was devoted to the one day food listing. When compared to the 20-60 minutes usually needed for a complete 24-hour dietary recall procedure, it is clear that the technique used in the present study provided only a rough estimate of the food and beverages each respondent consumed. The shorter procedure was necessary given the difficulties of interviewing homeless individuals and the need to keep the interview short to avoid breakoffs.

The one day food listing provides a general description of the eating patterns and the variety and types of food groups consumed by homeless persons.

FOOD CODE LIST FOR CODING INDIVIDUAL SURVEY FOR THE
PREPARED MEALS FOR THE HOMELESS PROJECT *

Food Name

Serving Portion

BREADS AND CEREALSBreads, rolls, crackers

1385	BREAD-CORN-HOME REC	2	PIECES
329	BREAD-FRENCH-ENRICHED	2	SLICES
1409	BREAD-PITTA	1	ITEM
338	BREAD-PUMPERNICKEL	2	SLICES
352	BREAD-WHITE-FIRM	2	SLICES
358	BREAD-WHOLE WHEAT-SOFT	2	SLICES
1471	BREAD-STUFFING	1	CUP
319	BAGEL-EGG	1	BAGEL
489	ROLL-HAMBURGER/HOTDOG	1	ROLL
487	ROLL-BROWN AND SERVE	2	ROLLS
1653	ROLL-WHOLE WHEAT	2	ROLLS
430	CRACKERS-GRAHAM-PLAIN	4	CRACKERS
432	CRACKERS-SALTINES	10	CRACKERS
1650	CRACKERS-TRISCUITS	10	CRACKERS
1651	CRACKERS-WHEAT THINS	12	CRACKERS

Cereals, cooked or ready-to-eat

1260	CEREAL-CREAM/WHEAT-INSTANT	1	CUP
363	CEREAL-CORN GRITS-REG/QUICK	1	CUP
366	CEREAL-OATMEAL-REGULAR/QUICK	1	CUP
1197	CEREAL-ALL BRAN	1/2	CUP
1211	CEREAL-CORN FLAKES-KELLOGG	1	CUP
1221	CEREAL-FROSTED MINI WHEATS	1	CUP
1227	CEREAL-HONEY NUT CHEERIOS	1	CUP
1236	CEREAL-NUTRI GRAIN-CORN	1	CUP
1245	CEREAL-RICE KRISPIES	1	CUP
1253	CEREAL-TOTAL	1	CUP

Noodles, macaroni, rice

438	MACARONI-ELBOW-ENRICHED	3/4-1	CUP
448	NOODLES-EGG-ENRICHED	3/4-1	CUP
1459	RICE-BROWN-UNCLE BEN'S	3/4-1	CUP
1685	RICE-SPANISH	3/4-1	CUP
482	RICE-WHITE-INSTANT-HOT	3/4-1	CUP

* Based in part on serving size recommendations contained in USDA-HNIS, 1986, Home and Garden Bulletin #232-1, except for grain products and a few other food items. During the pilot test, the grain food group portion sizes offered by providers varied greatly, but were generally larger than standard serving sizes. Therefore, larger portion sizes were established for grain products.

Pancakes, waffles, quick breads

452	PANCAKES-PLAIN-MIX	2	PANCAKES
1392	WAFFLES-FROZEN	2	WAFFLES
323	BISCUITS-PREPARED/MIX	2	BISCUITS (MED)
1729	CROISSANT-ROLL-SARA LEE	1	ROLL
444	MUFFIN-BRAN-HOME-REC	2	MUFFINS (MED)
1381	MUFFIN-ENGLISH-PLAIN	2	HALVES
1388	FRENCH TOAST-HOME RECIPE	2	SLICES

FRUITSJuice: fruit and vegetable

225	APPLE-CANNED/BOTTLED	1	CUP (6 - 8 OZ)
251	GRAPEFRUIT-CANNED-SWEET	1	CUP "
259	GRAPE-FROZ CONCEN-DIL	1	CUP "
266	LEMONADE-FROZ CONCEN-DIL	1	CUP "
278	ORANGE-FROZ CONCEN-DIL	1	CUP "
1434	V-8 VEGETABLE JUICE	1	CUP "

Citrus fruits

247	GRAPEFRUIT-RAW-WHITE	1	GRAPEFRUIT
273	ORANGE-RAW-ALL VARIETIES	1	ORANGE
316	TANGERINE-RAW	1	TANGERINE

Non-citrus fruits

945	APPLES-RAW-WITH SKIN	1	APPLE (MED-LG)
227	APPLESAUCE-CAN-UNSWEET	1/2-3/4	CUP
235	BANANAS-RAW	1	BANANA
977	FRUIT COCKTAIL-CAN/WATER	1/2-3/4	CUP
255	GRAPES-RAW	1/2-3/4	CUP
271	MELONS-CANTALOUPE-RAW	1/4	MELLON
286	PEACHES-CANNED-WATER PACK	1/2-3/4	CUP
283	PEACHES-RAW-WHOLE	2	PEACHES (MED)
291	PEARS-RAW	1	PEAR
1012	PEARS-CANNED-JUICE PACK	1/2-3/4	CUP
296	PINEAPPLE-CAN/SYRUP-BITS	1/2-3/4	CUP
295	PINEAPPLE-RAW-DICED	1/2-3/4	CUP
300	PLUMS-RAW-JAPANESE/HYBRID	2	PLUMS (MED)
980	SALAD-FRUIT-CAN/JUICE	1/2-3/4	CUP
318	WATERMELON-RAW	1-1 1/2	CUPS

Dried Fruits

230	APRICOTS-DRIED-RAW	7-10 HALVES
305	PRUNES-DRIED-W/O SUGAR	3-6 PRUNES (MED)
307	RAISINS-SEEDLESS	1/4 CUP

VEGETABLESStarchy vegetables

570	BEANS-LIMA-THIN-FROZ-BOIL	1/2-3/4 CUP
615	CORN-CREAMED-CANNED	1/2-3/4 CUP
1680	CORN-FRITTER(2 BY 1 1/2)	3-4 FRITTERS
617	CORN-SWEET-CAN-DRAINED	1/2-3/4 CUP
641	PEAS-GREEN-FROZ-BOIL-DRAIN	1/2-3/4 CUP
1144	POTATO-BAKED	1 POTATO
648	POTATO-FRENCH FRIED-RAW	1/2-3/4 CUP
650	POTATO-HASHED BROWN-FROZ	1/2-3/4 CUP
653	POTATO-MASHED-DEHY-FREP	1/2-3/4 CUP
1097	POTATO-PUFFS-FROZ-PAN FRIED	1/2-3/4 CUP
1112	SQUASH-ZUCCHINI-BOIL	1/2-3/4 CUP
665	SQUASH-WINTER-BAKE-MASH	1/2-3/4 CUP
1115	SUCOOTASH-BOIL-DRAIN	1/2-3/4 CUP
666	SWEET POTATO(YAM)-BAKE	1 POTATO

Dark green, yellow, and red

567	ASPARAGUS-FROZ-BOIL	1/2-3/4 CUP
590	EROCOLLI-FROZ-BOIL-DRAIN	1/2-3/4 CUP
591	BRUSSELS SPROUTS	1/2-3/4 CUP
600	CARROT-RAW	1 CARROT
634	CARROTS-FROZ-BOILED	1/2-3/4 CUP
610	COLLARDS(OTHER GREENS)-BOIL	1/2-3/4 CUP
643	PEPPERS-SWEET-RAW	1 PEPPER
659	SPINACH-OR GREENS-RAW	1-1 1/2 CUPS
660	SPINACH-RAW-BOIL-DRAIN	1/2-3/4 CUP
671	TOMATO-RAW-RED-RIPE	1 TOMATO
1699	TOMATO PASTE-CAN-SALT ADD	3/4-1 CUP

Other vegetables

572	BEANS-SNAP-GREEN-BOIL-CUTS	3/4-1	CUP
581	BEETS-SLICED-BOIL	3/4-1	CUP
595	CABBAGE-BOIL	3/4-1	CUP
605	CAULIFLOWER-RAW-CHOPPED	1	CUP
608	CELERY-PASCAL-RAW-STALK	1	STALK
619	CUCUMBER-RAW-SLICED	1	CUP
1072	KCHLRABI-BOIL-DRAIN	3/4-1	CUP
627	LETTUCE-ICEBERG-RAW-LEAVES	1-1 1/2	CUPS
630	MUSHROOMS-RAW-CHOPPED	1/2-3/4	CUP
1081	ONION RINGS-BATTERED-FRIED	1/2-3/4	CUP
1082	PEAS AND CARROTS-COOKED	1/2-3/4	CUP
1062	SALAD-COLESRAW	1/2-3/4	CUP
655	SALAD-POTATO	1/2-3/4	CUP
1776	SALAD-THREE BEAN-ALEX	1/2-3/4	CUP
680	VEGETABLES-MIXED-FROZ-BOIL	1/2-3/4	CUP

Soups: vegetable

716	SOUP-CREAM/MUSHROOM-WATER	1	CUP
831	SOUP-CREAM/POTATO-CAN-MILK	1	CUP
717	SOUP-MINESTRONE-CAN	1	CUP
719	SOUP-TOMATO-CAN-WATER	1	CUP
721	SOUP-VEGETARIAN-CAN-WATER	1	CUP
720	SOUP-VEGETABLE BEEF-CAN	1	CUP

MEATS AND MEAT ALTERNATESRed Meats

161	BACON-PORK-BROILED/FRIED	4	SLICES
750	ROAST BEEF SANDWICH	1	ITEM (2-3 OZ MEAT)
198	BOLOGNA-PORK	2-3	SLICES
1750	CHICKEN FRIED STEAK	4-5	OUNCES
174	CORNERD BEEF LOAF (JELLIED)	3-4	OUNCES
202	FRANKFURTER-HOT DOG-NO BUN	2	ITEMS
191	HAM-CAN-CHOPPED-LUNCH MEAT	2-3	OUNCES
189	HAM-ROASTED-REG-11% BONELESS	4-5	OUNCES
738	CHEESE BURGER	3-4	OUNCES
740	HAMBURGER	3-4	OUNCES
1741	MEATLOAF	4-5	OUNCES
192	PORK-CHOP-LEAN/FAT-BROILED	4-5	OUNCES
1621	POT ROAST-YANKEE	4-5	OUNCES
205	SALAMI-DRY OR HARD-PORK	2-3	SLICES
204	SAUSAGE-LINK-PORK-COOKED	3-4	LINKS
200	SAUSAGE-PATTY-COOKED-FRESH	3-4	PATTIES
170	STEAK-SIRLOIN-LEAN/FAT	4-5	OUNCES
166	ROAST BEEF-RIB-LEAN/FAT	4-5	OUNCES

Poultry

1739	FRIED CHICKEN DINNER (WHITE)	2	PIECES
1273	CHICKEN-BREAST-ROASTED	1	BREAST(4 OZ)
1293	CHICKEN-FRANKFURTER	2	ITEMS
1277	CHICKEN-LEG-ROASTED	2	PIECES
221	TURKEY-DARK/LIGHT-ROASTED	4	OUNCES
1299	TURK HAM-CURED THIGH MEAT	4	OUNCES
1303	TURKEY-ROLL-LIGHT/DARK	4	OUNCES
753	TURKEY SANDWICH	2-3	OUNCES

Fish

1574	CRAB/SALMON CAKE	2	CAKES
1573	FISH-COD-BROILED/BUTTER	4	OUNCES
149	FISH-STICK-BREAD-FROZ-COOK	4	PIECES
158	FISH-SHRIMP-FRENCH FRIED	5-6	SHRIMP
159	FISH-TUNA-CAN/OIL-DRAINED	4	OUNCES
1064	FISH-WHITE-BAKED-STUFFED	4	OUNCES
742	FRIED FILET OF FISH SANDWICH	1	PATTY(4 OZ)
160	SALAD-TUNA	1/2-3/4	CUP
154	SARDINES-CAN-OIL	1	CAN

Eggs and egg dishes

99	EGG-FRIED IN BUTTER-LARGE	2	EGGS
100	EGG-HARD-LARGE-NO SHELL	2	EGGS
102	EGG-SCRAMBLED-MILK/BUTTER	2	EGGS
1407	OMELET-HAM AND CHEESE	3	EGGS
1649	QUICHE LORRAINE	1	SLICE

Dried beans and peas

123	BEANS-GARBANZO-CAN	1/2-3/4	CUP
514	BEANS-RED KIDNEY-CAN	1/2-3/4	CUP
1735	BEANS-REFRIED-SAUSAGE-CAN	1/2-3/4	CUP
516	PEAS-BLACKEYE-BOIL-DRAIN	1/2-3/4	CUP
525	PEAS-SPLIT-DRY-COOKED	1/2-3/4	CUP
522	LENTILS-WHOLE-COOKED	1/2-3/4	CUP

Peanut butter, nuts and seeds

524	PEANUT BUTTER-SMOOTH TYPE	4	TABLESPOONS
523	NUTS-PEANUTS-OIL ROASTED	1/4-1/2	CUP
528	SEEDS-SUNFLOWER-DRIED	1/4-1/2	CUP

Mixed meat dishes

1667	TACO	2	ITEMS
498	SPAGHETTI/TOM/MEAT-CAN	1-1 1/2	CUP
77	BEEF-RAVIOLIS-CANNED	"	CUP
179	CHILI CON CARNE/BEANS-CAN	"	CUP
177	BEEF & VEGETABLE STEW	"	CUP
1406	ENCHILADA	1	ITEM
512	BEANS/PORK/TOM SAUCE-CAN	1-1 1/2	CUP
216	CHICKEN CHOW MEIN-CANNED	"	CUP
178	BEEF POTPIE-HOME RECIPE	1	SMALL PIE
1647	EGG ROLL-BEEF/SHRIMP-FROZ	2	EGG ROLLS
1648	FISH & CHIPS-VAN DE KAMPS	2	PIECES
751	BEEF/CHEESE SANDWICH	1	ITEM
754	CLUB SANDWICH	1	ITEM
752	HAM/CHEESE SANDWICH	1	ITEM
745	BEEF BURRITO	2	ITEM
748	TOSTADO-REGULAR	2	ITEM
2009	LASAGNA	1	SLICE
463	STUFFED GREEN PEPPERS	1	PEPPER
214	CHICKEN A LA KING	1-1 1/2	CUP
215	CHICKEN AND NOODLES	1-1 1/2	CUP
218	CHICKEN POTPIE	1	SMALL PIE
1452	CABBAGE ROLLS-STUFFED	2	ROLLS
459	TUNA/NOODLE CASSEROLE	1-1 1/2	CUP

Soups: dried bean, meat, poultry

711	SOUP-BEAN/BACON/CAN	1	CUP
1338	SOUP-BEEF-CHUNKY-CAN	1	CUP
827	SOUP-CHICKEN NOODLE-CAN	1	CUP
1341	SOUP-CHICKEN/RICE	1	CUP
828	SOUP-CLAM-NEW ENGLAND	1	CUP
1347	SOUP-LENTIL/HAM-CAN	1	CUP
718	SOUP-SPLIT PEA/HAM	1	CUP

MILK AND MILK PRODUCTSMilk

50	MILK-WHOLE-3.3% FAT-FLUID	1	CUP (8 OZ)
51	MILK-2% FAT-LOWFAT-FLUID	1	CUP "
54	MILK-1% FAT-LOWFAT-FLUID	1	CUP "
67	MILK-CHOC-4%-FLUID	1	CUP "
57	MILK-NONEFAT-FLUID	1	CUP "
908	HOT COCOA-PREP/MILK-HOME	1	CUP "

Cheese

22	CHEESE-AMERICAN-PROCESSED	2-3	SLICES
3	CHEESE-CHEEDAR-CUT PIECES	2-3	SLICES
21	CHEESE-SWISS	2-3	SLICES
11	CHEESE-CREAM	2-4	TABLESPOONS
7	CHEESE-COTTAGE-4%-SM CURD	1	CUP
9	CHEESE-COTTAGE-1% LOW FAT	1	CUP
13	CHEESE-MOZZARELLA-SKIM MLK	2-3	SLICES

Yogurt

94	YOGURT-PLAIN-NONFAT	1	CUP
92	YOGURT-FRUIT FLAVOR-LOWFAT	1	CUP
1747	FROZ YOGURT-FRUIT VARIETY	1	CUP

Mixed cheese dish

1441	CHEESE STUFFED PASTA SHELLS	1-1 1/2	CUP
475	PIZZA-CHEESE-BAKED	2	SLICE
1668	PIZZA-PEPPERONI-BAKED	2	SLICE
442	MACARONI & CHEESE-ENR-HOME	1-1 1/2	CUP

Ice cream, pudding, and ice milk

78	ICE CREAM-VAN-SOFT SERVE	1	CUP
80	ICE CREAM-VAN-HARD-16% FAT	1	CUP
82	ICE MILK-VAN-HARD-4.3% FAT	1	CUP
74	MILKSHAKE-VANILLA-THICK	8-10	OUNCES
90	PUDD-CHOC-COOKED-MIX/MILK	1	CUP
85	SHERBET-ORANGE-2% FAT	1	CUP

Fats and oils

104	BUTTER-REGULAR-TABLESPOON	1	TABLESPOON
36	CREAM-SOUR-CULTURED	2-3	TABLESPOON
42	CREAM-WHIP-IMIT-FROZ	2	TABLESPOON
26	CREAM-HALF & HALF-FLUID	2	TABLESPOON
844	GRAVY-MUSHROOM-CANNED	2	TABLESPOON
924	MARGARINE-CORN-REG-HARD	1	TABLESPOON
1766	SAL DRESS-GREEN GODDESS	2	TABLESPOON
137	SAL DRESS-ITALIAN-LOW CAL	2	TABLESPOON
1765	SAL DRESS-RANCH STYLE	2	TABLESPOON
142	SAL DRESS-THOUSAND ISLAND	2	TABLESPOON
942	SAL DRESS-VINEGAR/OIL-HOME	2	TABLESPOON
685	SAUCE-BARBECUE	2	TABLESPOON
141	SAUCE-TARTAR-REGULAR	2	TABLESPOON
126	VEGETABLE OIL-SAFFLOWER	1	TABLESPOON

Salty snacks: chips pretzels, popcorn

479	PRETZEL-DUTCH-TWISTED	2-3	PRETZELS
481	PRETZEL-THIN-STICK	10-15	STICKS
1646	TORTILLA CHIPS-DORITOS	15-20	CHIPS
654	POTATO CHIPS-SALT ADDED	15-20	CHIPS
1389	CORN CHIPS	15-20	CHIPS
476	POPCORN-POPPED-PLAIN	2	CUPS
1423	CRACKERS-CHEEDAR SNACKS	10	CRACKERS

Baked goods

1422	CRACKERS-ANIMAL	10-15	ITEM
413	BROWNIES/NUTS-MIX/PREP	2	ITEM
1824	CAKE-CARROT	1	SLICE
1399	CAKE-CHEESECAKE-COMMERCIAL	1	SLICE
392	CAKE-CHOCOLATE	1	SLICE
409	CAKE-POUND-HOME RECIPE	1	SLICE
397	CAKE-WHITE-CHOC ICING	1	SLICE
415	COOKIE-CHOCOLATE CHIP-MIX	3	COOKIES
420	COOKIE-OATMEAL/RAISIN-MIX	3	COOKIES
422	COOKIE-SANDWICH-CHOC/VAN	3	COOKIES
390	CUP CAKES-CHOC ICING	1	CAKE
437	DOUGHNUTS-YEAST-GLAZED	1	ITEM
1383	GRANOLA BAR	1	ITEM
1098	PUMPKIN PIE (CRUST)	1	SLICE
1403	TURNOVER-APPLE	1	TURNOVER
1762	TWINKIE-HOSTESS	1	ITEM

Sweets: candy and jello

544	CANDY-HARD	5	PIECES
1787	CANDY-JELLY BEANS	1/2	CUP
1676	CANDY-MILK CHOC/ALMONDS	1/2	CUP
1781	CANDY-M & M'S-PACKAGE	1	SMALL PACKAGE
1783	CANDY-MILKY WAY BAR	1	CANDY BAR
1789	CANDY-PEANUT BUTTER CUP	2	CUP
1782	CANDY-SNICKERS BAR	1	CANDY BAR
548	HONEY-STRAINED/EXTRACTED	1	TABLESPOON
549	JAMS/PRESERVES-REGULAR	1	TABLESPOON
699	JELLO	1	CUP
707	POPSICLE	1	ITEM
554	SYRUP-CHOC FLAVORED-FUDGE	1	TABLESPOON
560	SYRUP-PANCAKE-KARO	1	TABLESPOON
561	SUGAR-WHITE-GRANULATED	1	TABLESPOON

Carbonated drinks, coffee, tea

693	COLA-TYPE-SODA	12	FL OUNCES
696	ROOT BEER-SODA	12	FL OUNCES
1780	FRUIT PUNCH DRINK	12	FL OUNCES
694	GRAPE SODA	12	FL OUNCES
731	COFFEE-BREWED	1	CUP (W/SUGAR)
733	TEA-BREWED	1	CUP (W/SUGAR)

Alcoholic beverages

868	BEER-BUDWEISER	12	FL OUNCES
869	BEER-LIGHT	12	FL OUNCES
1481	WINE	4.5	FL OUNCES
687	WHISKEY	1.5	FL OUNCES